arXiv:hep-th/0701164v1 18 Jan 2007

Quantum Jet Theory I: Free fields

T. A. Larsson
Vanadisvägen 29, S-113 23 Stockholm, Sweden
email: thomas.larsson@hdd.se

February 2, 2008

Abstract

QJT (Quantum Jet Theory) is the quantum theory of jets, which can be canonically identified with truncated Taylor series. Ultralocality requires a novel quantization scheme, where dynamics is treated as a constraint in the history phase space. QJT differs from QFT since it involves a new datum: the expansion point. This difference is substantial because it leads to new gauge and diff anomalies, which are necessary to combine background independence with locality. Physically, the new ingredient is that the observer's trajectory is explicitly introduced and quantized together with the fields. In this paper the harmonic oscillator and free fields are treated within QJT, correcting previous flaws. The standard Hilbert space is recovered for the harmonic oscillator, but there are interesting modifications already for the free scalar field, due to quantization of the observer's trajectory. Only free fields are treated in detail, but the complications when interactions are introduced are briefly discussed. We also explain why QJT is necessary to resolve the conceptual problems of quantum gravity.

PACS (2003): 03.65.Ca, 03.70.+k, 11.10.Ef.

Keywords: Quantum jet theory, Covariant canonical quantization, History phase space, BRST, Cohomology.

1 Introduction

MCCQ (manifestly covariant canonical quantization) is a novel quantization scheme, first proposed in [9]. As the name indicates, this is a canonical quantization method which maintains manifest covariance at all levels. This is achieved through two inventions:

1. Dynamics is regarded as a constraint in the phase space of arbitrary histories, which allows us to apply powerful cohomological methods.
2. All fields are expanded in a Taylor series around an operator-valued curve, which is naturally identified as the observer's trajectory in spacetime. Hence all fields are replaced by their jets, which motivates the name Quantum Jet Theory (QJT).

The first invention is mainly technical. Manifest covariance greatly simplifies the understanding of constrained systems, in particular general relativity. Since the covariant constraint algebra is the spacetime diffeomorphism algebra rather than the Dirac algebra, we can profit from its projective representation theory developed in [7, 15]. The outstanding lesson from this theory is that in order to construct quantum representations of the diffeomorphism algebra, we must introduce and quantize the observer's trajectory. In an ultralocal theory like QJT, dynamics must be formulated without reference to nonlocal integrals; this is further discussed in subsection 10.1. The history-orientated approach has this crucial property.

In constrast, the second invention is physically important. When replacing fields by their Taylor expansions, we introduce a new datum: the expansion point (or rather the expansion curve). This makes it possible to write down new extensions of the algebras of gauge transformations and diffeomorphisms, generalizing affine and Virasoro algebras to higher dimensions. The relevant cocycles are functionals of the observer's trajectory, which explains why they cannot be formulated within QFT proper, where this trajectory has not been introduced. Gauge and diff anomalies in QFT were classified long ago [1], leaving no room for new ones. The fact that we do find new anomalies shows that QJT is substantially different from QFT. This should be a good thing, because we know that QFT is incompatible with gravity, and QJT may lack this defect. Nevertheless, QJT is close to QFT, in the same sense as a Taylor series is close to the function to which it converges. Therefore, we expect QJT to inherit the pragmatic successes of QFT. The relation between QJT and QFT, and why the former are necessary to formulate a consistent quantum theory of gravity, are further discussed in section 10.

Before we can have confidence in a new quantization method, we must first verify that it reproduces the correct answers to well-understood problems. MCCQ, as formulated in [9], fails this test already for the harmonic oscillator. There were two major flaws in that paper: there are spurious states which are not removed in cohomology, and no inner product was defined. The purpose of the present paper is to correct these errors. We show here that the corrected version of MCCQ reproduces the correct spectrum and inner product of the harmonic oscillator, and more generally of any free theory, without any overcounting of states. The ingredients missing in [9] are additional constraints, which remove remaining antifields and identify momenta and velocities.

Unfortunately, the additional constraints which eliminate the spurious cohomology also break manifest covariance, and hence covariance is only recovered in a weaker form. This is explained in subsection 10.2. The BRST operator $Q = Q_D + Q_\mathcal{M}$ consists of two parts. The momentum part $Q_\mathcal{M}$ violates covariance, but the dynamics part Q_D does not; it commutes with Poincaré transformations, and in the general-covariant context with spacetime diffeomorphisms. Hence covariance is maintained in the sense that $H^0(Q_D)$ carries a representation of the covariance algebra. Such representations were constructed in [9, 10, 11, 12]; the main error in those papers was that $Q_\mathcal{M}$ was not considered. However, $H^0(Q_D)$ is not a Hilbert space, because there is no interesting inner product before the momentum constraint has been imposed.

An important difference between QJT and QFT is that in the former, the relevant covariance algebras, e.g. gauge or diffeomorphism algebras, act in a well-defined manner at the quantum level. After quantization, the history phase space $\mathcal{HP}$ and the classical cohomology $H^0_{cl}(Q_D)$ turn into linear spaces which carry projective, lowest-energy representations of the relevant algebras. Indeed, it is this property which dictates the form of QJT, since it grew out of the representation theory of the extended diffeomorphism algebra (multi-dimensional Virasoro algebra), developed in [7, 15]. As is well-known from low-dimensional models, in particular from lineal gravity [6], a detailed understanding of how the gauge symmetries act on the quantum level is crucial for a correct treatment. This is only possible within QJT.

History methods have previously been considered by Isham, Savvidou and coworkers [5, 17], and jet space formalism has been employed by Sardanashvily [16]. There might be some overlap between their works and the present paper. However, they do not cover the most important aspects of QJT, namely the identification of the expansion point with the observer's position and the appearence of new anomalies.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 contains a list of notation. The harmonic oscillator is treated in section 3, and it is verified that we recover the correct Hilbert space with the correct inner product. Section 4 deals with the free particle, which is important in QJT because it applies to the observer's trajectory. In section 5 the method is extended to the free scalar field, and again we recover the correct results. However, despite the Lorentz invariance of the final results, we are forced to introduce a privileged vector in the time direction, which we identify as the observer's 4-velocity. To eliminate the last remnants of non-covariance, we must introduce Quantum Jet Theory. In section 6, QJT is applied to the harmonic oscillator, and the correct results are again recovered. In section 7, QJT is applied to the free scalar field. Unlike the situation for the harmonic oscillator, we here see some deviations from the QFT treatment. This is partly expected because QJT amounts to a p-jet regularization of the fields, but some new phenomena survive the $p \to \infty$ limit, especially reparametrization anomalies. In section 8, we treat the free Maxwell field within QJT. The new ingredients here are gauge symmetries, which are neatly incorporated into the cohomological implementation of dynamics. Although the treatment of interactions is deferred to a later paper, we briefly indicate in section 9 how they modify the formalism. The final section 10 contains a general discussion of the philosophical issues raised by QJT, in particular regarding quantum gravity, and directions for future work.

2 List of notation

μ, ν	Spacetime index
α, β, γ	History index
a, b, c	Gauge index
ω, ϖ, υ	Solution index
$M = (M_1, ..., M_d), N$	Multi-index
x^μ	Spacetime coordinate
$x = x^0$	Time coordinate in QM
t	Parameter along observer's trajectory
k_μ	Fourier variable matching x^μ
k	Fourier variable matching x
m	Fourier variable matching t

$\phi(x), \phi(k)$	Spacetime field (history)
$\pi(x), \pi(k)$	History momentum
$\phi^*(x), \phi^*(k)$	Dynamics antifield
$\pi^*(x), \pi^*(k)$	Dynamics antifield momentum

$q^\mu(t)$	Observer's trajectory (free particle)
$p_\mu(t)$	Observer's momentum
$q^\mu_*(t), p^*(t)$	Associated antifields
$\phi_M(t), \phi_M(m)$	Jet corresponding to $\phi(x)$
$\pi_M(t), \pi_M(m)$	Jet momentum
$\phi^*_M(t), \phi^*_M(m)$	Antijet (dynamics)
$\pi^*_M(t), \pi^*_M(m)$	Antijet momentum (dynamics)
$\bar\phi_M(t), \bar\phi_M(m)$	Antijet (time)
$\bar\pi_M(t), \bar\pi_M(m)$	Antijet momentum (time)
$\bar\phi^*_M(t), \bar\phi^*_M(m)$	Antijet (dynamics+time)
$\bar\pi^*_M(t), \bar\pi^*_M(m)$	Antijet momentum (dynamics+time)

$\mathcal{E}(x), \mathcal{E}_k$	Dynamics constraint
$\mathcal{M}(x), \mathcal{M}_k$	Momentum constraint
$\mathcal{E}_M(t), \mathcal{E}_M(m)$	Dynamics constraint jet
$\mathcal{M}_M(t), \mathcal{M}_M(m)$	Momentum constraint jet
$\mathcal{T}_M(t), \mathcal{T}_M(m)$	Time constraint jet
$\mathcal{R}_M(t), \mathcal{R}_M(m)$	Dynamics+time constraint jet
Q, Q_{TOT}	Total BRST operator
$Q_D, Q_T, Q_{\mathcal{M}}...$	Partial BRST operators
$\mathcal{H}$	Hamiltonian
$\mathcal{HP}$	History phase space
$\mathcal{HP}^*$	Extended history phase space
$\mathcal{P}$	Physical phase space
$H^0_{cl}(Q) = C(\mathcal{P})$	Classical cohomology
$\mathfrak{H} = H^0_{st}(Q)$	Hilbert space (state cohomology)
$H^0_{op}(Q)$	Space of physical operators (operator cohomology)

3 The harmonic oscillator

3.1 Conventional canonical quantization

For consistency with later developments, we denote the time coordinate by x (to be thought of as x^0) and the oscillator degree of freedom by $\phi(x)$. The action

$$S = \frac{1}{2}\int dx\ (\phi'(x)^2 - \omega^2\phi(x)^2), \tag{3.1}$$

where $\phi' = d\phi/dx$, leads to the Euler-Lagrange (EL) equation

$$\mathcal{E}(x) \equiv -\frac{\delta S}{\delta\phi(x)} = \phi''(x) + \omega^2\phi(x) = 0. \tag{3.2}$$

In the Hamiltonian formalism, we introduce canonical momenta

$$\pi(x) = \phi'(x), \tag{3.3}$$

subject to the equal-time commutation relations

$$[\phi(x), \pi(x)] = i, \qquad [\phi(x), \phi(x)] = [\pi(x), \pi(x)] = 0. \tag{3.4}$$

The phase space $\mathcal{P}$ is spanned by pairs of variables (ϕ, π). The time evolution of any function $F(\phi, \pi)$ over $\mathcal{P}$ is governed by Hamilton's equations of motion $F'(x) = i[\mathcal{H}, F(x)]$, where the time-independent Hamiltonian is

$$\mathcal{H} \ = \ \frac{1}{2}(\pi^2 + \omega^2\phi^2). \tag{3.5}$$

In particular,

$$\phi'(x) = \pi(x), \qquad \pi'(x) = -\omega^2\phi(x), \tag{3.6}$$

which is equivalent to the EL equation (3.2).

Alternatively, we can choose a basis in $\mathcal{P}$ of annihilation and creation operators,

$$a = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\omega}}(\omega\phi + i\pi), \qquad a^\dagger = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\omega}}(\omega\phi - i\pi). \tag{3.7}$$

They satisfy canonical commutation relations (CCR)

$$[a, a^\dagger] = 1. \tag{3.8}$$

In terms of these variables, the Hamiltonian (3.5) becomes

$$\mathcal{H} = \omega a^\dagger a, \tag{3.9}$$

and time evolution is simply given by

$$a'(x) = -i\omega a(x), \qquad (a^\dagger)'(x) = i\omega a^\dagger(x). \tag{3.10}$$

The creation and annihilation operators thus carry energy ω and $-\omega$, respectively, i.e.

$$[\mathcal{H}, a^\dagger] = \omega a^\dagger, \qquad [\mathcal{H}, a] = -\omega a. \tag{3.11}$$

To quantize the theory, we introduce a vacuum state $\big|0\big\rangle$, which is annihilated by all annihilation operators, i.e. $a\big|0\big\rangle = 0$. A basis for the Hilbert space is given by the n-quanta states

$$\big|n\big\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n!}}(a^\dagger)^n\big|0\big\rangle. \tag{3.12}$$

$\big|n\big\rangle$ is an eigenvector of the Hamiltonian with energy $n\omega$:

$$\mathcal{H}\big|n\big\rangle = n\omega\big|n\big\rangle. \tag{3.13}$$

Dually, we define

$$\big\langle n\big| = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n!}}\big\langle 0\big|a^n \tag{3.14}$$

If we choose normalization such that $\big\langle 0\big|0\big\rangle = 1$, the inner product in the Hilbert space is

$$\big\langle m\big|n\big\rangle = \delta_{mn}, \tag{3.15}$$

which obviously is positive-definite.

3.2 History phase space

Let us now explain how to recover this well-known story by treating dynamics as a constraint in the history phase space. Introduce virtual histories $\phi(x)$ with canonical momenta $\pi(x) = -i\delta/\delta\phi(x)$, subject to the Heisenberg algebra

$$[\phi(x), \pi(x')] = i\delta(x - x'), \qquad [\phi(x), \phi(x')] = [\pi(x), \pi(x')] = 0. \tag{3.16}$$

Note that these brackets vanish whenever $x \neq x'$; (3.16) are the CCR in history phase space $\mathcal{HP}$, which has the basis $(\phi(x), \pi(x))_{x\in\mathbb{R}}$. $\mathcal{HP}$ has an alternative basis of Fourier modes (ϕ_k, π_k), in terms of which the CCR become

$$[\phi_k, \pi_{k'}] = i\delta_{k+k'}, \qquad [\phi_k, \phi_{k'}] = [\pi_k, \pi_{k'}] = 0. \tag{3.17}$$

To avoid problems with the continuum limit, we assume for the time being that the Fourier variable $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ is discrete, and that $\pm\omega \in \mathbb{Z}$; the continuum case is discussed in subsection 3.7 below. The EL equation (3.2) clearly has two solutions, ϕ_ω and $\phi_{-\omega}$, which correspond to the solutions in real space

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(x) &= \phi_\omega \mathrm{e}^{i\omega x} + \phi_{-\omega} \mathrm{e}^{-i\omega x}, \\ \pi(x) &= i\omega\phi_\omega \mathrm{e}^{i\omega x} - i\omega\phi_{-\omega} \mathrm{e}^{-i\omega x}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.18}$$

It is clear that the history phase space $\mathcal{HP}$ is vastly larger than the usual phase space $\mathcal{P}$; the former has dimension $2 \times \infty$ and the latter has dimension 2. To properly describe the harmonic oscillator in $\mathcal{HP}$, we must thus eliminate all but two of these $2 \times \infty$ variables. The strategy for doing this is to view dynamics as a constraint in the history phase space. The EL equations (3.2) become *the dynamics constraint*,

$$\mathcal{E}_k \equiv (k^2 - \omega^2)\phi_k \approx 0, \tag{3.19}$$

and the definition of momentum becomes *the momentum constraint*

$$\mathcal{M}_k \equiv \pi_k - ik\phi_k \approx 0. \tag{3.20}$$

As usual, wiggly equality signs indicate equality modulo constraints. $\mathcal{E}_k$ and $\mathcal{M}_k$ are collected into the constraint vector

$$\chi_k = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{E}_k \\ \mathcal{M}_k \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} (k^2 - \omega^2)\phi_k \\ \pi_k - ik\phi_k \end{pmatrix} \tag{3.21}$$

with Poisson-bracket matrix

$$\Delta_{kk'} = [\chi_k, \chi_{k'}] = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & i(k^2 - \omega^2) \\ -i(k^2 - \omega^2) & 2k \end{pmatrix} \delta_{k+k'}. \tag{3.22}$$

$\Delta_{kk'}$ clearly has a block diagonal form, so we may consider each $(k, -k)$ pair separately. For $k \neq \pm\omega$, the matrix is non-singular and the constraint $\chi_k \approx 0$ is second class. We can then define Dirac brackets

$$[F, G]^* = [F, G] - \sum_k \sum_{k'} [F, \chi_k] \Delta^{kk'} [\chi_{k'}, G], \tag{3.23}$$

where $\Delta^{kk'}$ is the inverse of $\Delta_{kk'}$, and eliminate the constraints. This leads to $\phi_k \approx \pi_k \approx 0$.

For $k = \pm\omega$ the dynamics constraint $\mathcal{E}_\omega = \mathcal{E}_{-\omega}$ vanishes, (3.22) is singular, and we can only impose the momentum constraints $\mathcal{M}_\omega \approx \mathcal{M}_{-\omega} \approx 0$. The non-singular part of the Poisson bracket matrix is now

$$\Delta_{\omega,-\omega} = [\mathcal{M}_\omega, \mathcal{M}_{-\omega}] = 2\omega. \tag{3.24}$$

The corresponding Dirac brackets commute with the momentum constraints, and we may eliminate two of the four variables $\phi_\omega, \phi_{-\omega}, \pi_\omega, \pi_{-\omega}$ in terms of the two others. Denote the independent solutions by

$$\begin{aligned} a_\omega &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\omega}}(\pi_\omega + i\omega\phi_\omega) \approx \sqrt{\frac{2}{\omega}}\pi_\omega \approx i\sqrt{2\omega}\phi_\omega, \\ a_{-\omega} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\omega}}(\pi_{-\omega} - i\omega\phi_{-\omega}) \approx \sqrt{\frac{2}{\omega}}\pi_{-\omega} \approx -i\sqrt{2\omega}\phi_{-\omega}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.25}$$

Since $[a_\omega, a_{-\omega}] = -1$, we can identify $a_\omega = a^\dagger$, $a_{-\omega} = a$, where a and $a^\dagger$ are defined as in (3.7).

The Hamiltonian in $\mathcal{HP}$ is simply the generator of rigid time translations, i.e.

$$\mathcal{H} = \int dx\ \phi'(x)\pi(x) = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} ik\phi_k\pi_{-k}. \tag{3.26}$$

On the constraint surface,

$$\mathcal{H} \approx i\omega(\phi_\omega\pi_{-\omega} - \phi_{-\omega}\pi_\omega) = \omega a_\omega a_{-\omega}, \tag{3.27}$$

which of course is the same as (3.9).

3.3 Cohomological description I

In the previous section we described the harmonic oscillator as a constrained system in the history phase space, and then recovered the standard formulation by eliminating these second-class constraints. By itself, this amounts to nothing. The advantage of this viewpoint is that it suggests a different procedure: divide the constraints into two sets, and regard one set as a first class constraint and the other as a gauge fixation. This allows us to employ powerful cohomological (BRST) methods.

The division of the constraints into first class and gauge conditions is not unique, and will be done in different ways. In this subsection we deal with a corrected version of the method presented in [9], and in subsections 3.5 and 3.6 we introduce other cohomological descriptions.

To eliminate the unphysical variables in cohomology, we introduce fermionic antifields ϕ^*_k with canonical momenta π^*_k, subject to the canonical anticommutation relations (CAR)

$$\{\phi^*_k, \pi^*_{k'}\} = \delta_{k+k'}, \qquad \{\phi^*_k, \phi^*_{k'}\} = \{\pi^*_k, \pi^*_{k'}\} = 0. \tag{3.28}$$

Denote the the extended history phase space by $\mathcal{HP}^*$, and the space of functions over it by $C(\mathcal{HP}^*) = C(\phi, \phi^*, \pi, \pi^*)$. The dynamics constraint is implemented by the BRST charge $Q = Q_D$,

$$Q_D = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \mathcal{E}_k \pi^*_{-k} = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} (k^2 - \omega^2)\phi_k \pi^*_{-k}, \tag{3.29}$$

which acts as $\delta_D F = [Q_D, F]$:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_D \phi_k &= 0 & \delta_D \pi_k &= i(k^2 - \omega^2)\pi^*_k, \\ \delta_D \phi^*_k &= (k^2 - \omega^2)\phi_k, & \delta_D \pi^*_k &= 0. \end{aligned} \tag{3.30}$$

Let us fix $k \neq \pm\omega$, so $k^2 - \omega^2 \neq 0$. It is clear that $\ker \delta_D$ consists of ϕ_k and π^*_k, because $\delta_D \pi_k$ and $\delta_D \phi^*_k$ are nonzero. However, both $\phi_k = \delta_D(\phi^*_k/(k^2 - \omega^2))$ and $\pi^*_k = -i\delta_D(\pi_k/(k^2 - \omega^2))$ are exact, and hence all four variables ϕ_k, ϕ^*_k, π_k and π^*_k vanish in cohomology.

In contrast, when $k^2 - \omega^2 = 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\delta_D \phi_\omega = \delta_D \pi_\omega = \delta_D \phi^*_\omega = \delta_D \pi^*_\omega = 0, \\ &\delta_D \phi_{-\omega} = \delta_D \pi_{-\omega} = \delta_D \phi^*_{-\omega} = \delta_D \pi^*_{-\omega} = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{3.31}$$

Hence the cohomology groups are generated by all eight variables with $k = \pm\omega$. This is clearly an overcounting, because we know that the correct phase space is generated by only two variables a and $a^\dagger$ (3.7). It was argued in [9] that this overcounting would disappear when interactions are introduced. However, this argument was wrong. To eliminate overcounting, further terms must be added to the BRST charge.

To eliminate $\phi^*_\omega, \phi^*_{-\omega}, \pi^*_\omega, \pi^*_{-\omega}$ we introduce bosonic antifields θ_ω and $\theta_{-\omega}$ with canonical momenta χ_ω and $\chi_{-\omega}$. They satisfy the CCR

$$[\theta_k, \chi_{k'}] = i\delta_{k+k'}, \qquad [\theta_k, \theta_{k'}] = [\chi_k, \chi_{k'}] = 0, \tag{3.32}$$

where $k, k' = \pm\omega$. The *antifield constraint* $\phi^*_\omega \approx \phi^*_{-\omega} \approx \pi^*_\omega \approx \pi^*_{-\omega} \approx 0$ is implemented by the BRST operator

$$Q_A = \phi^*_\omega \chi_{-\omega} + \phi^*_{-\omega} \chi_\omega, \tag{3.33}$$

which acts in an extended phase space with basis ϕ_k, π_k, ϕ^*_k, π^*_k, $\theta_{\pm\omega}$, $\chi_{\pm\omega}$; this space is still denoted by $\mathcal{HP}^*$. It is clear that $\{Q_D, Q_A\} = 0$, because Q_D is independent of all modes with $k = \pm\omega$. The antifield constraint acts as $\delta_A F = [Q_A, F]$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_A \phi^*_\omega &= 0, & \delta_A \phi^*_{-\omega} &= 0, \\ \delta_A \pi^*_\omega &= \chi_\omega, & \delta_A \pi^*_{-\omega} &= \chi_{-\omega}, \\ \delta_A \theta_\omega &= -i\phi^*_\omega, & \delta_A \theta_{-\omega} &= -i\phi^*_{-\omega}, \\ \delta_A \chi_\omega &= 0, & \delta_A \chi_{-\omega} &= 0. \end{aligned} \tag{3.34}$$

Hence $\ker \delta_A = \operatorname{im} \delta_A = C(\phi^*_\omega, \phi^*_{-\omega}, \chi_\omega, \chi_{-\omega})$. The kernel and image are the same, and all variables vanish in cohomology. We are thus left with the four variables $\phi_{\pm\omega}$ and $\pi_{\pm\omega}$, two of which need to be eliminated. To this end, we consider the *momentum constraints*

$$\mathcal{M}_\omega = \pi_\omega - i\omega\phi_\omega, \qquad \mathcal{M}_{-\omega} = \pi_{-\omega} + i\omega\phi_{-\omega}, \tag{3.35}$$

which satisfy

$$[\mathcal{M}_\omega, \mathcal{M}_{-\omega}] = 2\omega. \tag{3.36}$$

Since these constraints have a nonzero Poisson bracket, they are second class. We must therefore consider one of them, say $\mathcal{M}_\omega$, as a first-class constraint, and the other as a gauge fixation. To implement this in cohomology, we can introduce two canonically conjugate fermionic antifields β_ω and $\beta_{-\omega}$:

$$\{\beta_\omega, \beta_{-\omega}\} = 1, \qquad \{\beta_\omega, \beta_\omega\} = \{\beta_{-\omega}, \beta_{-\omega}\} = 0. \tag{3.37}$$

One way to impose the momentum constraints is to choose the BRST charge

$$Q_\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_\omega \beta_{-\omega} \tag{3.38}$$

It is clear that $\{Q_\mathcal{M}, Q_\mathcal{M}\} = 0$, since $[\mathcal{M}_\omega, \mathcal{M}_\omega] = 0$ in view of (3.35). Moreover, $\{Q_D, Q_\mathcal{M}\} = \{Q_A, Q_\mathcal{M}\} = 0$, because Q_D is independent of all modes with $k = \pm\omega$ and Q_A is independent of $\phi_{\pm\omega}$ and $\pi_{\pm\omega}$. $Q_\mathcal{M}$ acts on functions over $\mathcal{HP}^*$ as $\delta_\mathcal{M} F = [Q_\mathcal{M}, F]$; the relevant piece is on the modes with $k = \pm\omega$:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_\mathcal{M} \phi_\omega &= 0 & \delta_\mathcal{M} \phi_{-\omega} &= -i\beta_{-\omega} \\ \delta_\mathcal{M} \pi_\omega &= 0 & \delta_\mathcal{M} \pi_{-\omega} &= \omega\beta_{-\omega} \\ \delta_\mathcal{M} \beta_\omega &= \mathcal{M}_\omega & \delta_\mathcal{M} \beta_{-\omega} &= 0. \end{aligned} \tag{3.39}$$

In particular,

$$\delta_{\mathcal{M}}\mathcal{M}_\omega = 0, \qquad \delta_{\mathcal{M}}\mathcal{M}_{-\omega} = 2\omega\beta_{-\omega}. \tag{3.40}$$

$\ker Q_{\mathcal{M}}$ is generated by ϕ_ω, π_ω, $\beta_{-\omega}$, and $\pi_{-\omega} - i\omega\phi_{-\omega}$. $\operatorname{im} Q_{\mathcal{M}}$ is generated by $\mathcal{M}_\omega = \pi_\omega - i\omega\phi_\omega$ and $\beta_{-\omega}$. The cohomology $H^\bullet_{cl}(Q_{\mathcal{M}})$ is thus generated by

$$\begin{aligned} a_\omega &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\omega}}(\pi_w + i\omega\phi_\omega) + x\mathcal{M}_\omega, \\ a_{-\omega} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\omega}}(\pi_{-\omega} - i\omega\phi_{-\omega}), \end{aligned} \tag{3.41}$$

where x is an arbitrary constant. They have the nonzero brackets

$$[a_\omega, a_{-\omega}] = -1. \tag{3.42}$$

In particular, $a_{-\omega}$ commutes with $\mathcal{M}_\omega$, so the bracket is independent of the parameter x, as is necessary because it must be well-defined in cohomology. If we make the particular choice $x = 0$, a_ω also commutes with $\mathcal{M}_{-\omega}$, and we can identify $a_\omega = a^\dagger$, $a_{-\omega} = a$ in (3.7) and (3.25).

Let us summarize the construction in this subsection. We started from the space of functions over the extended phase space, $C(\phi_k, \pi_k, \phi^*_k, \pi^*_k, \theta_\omega, \chi_{-\omega}, \theta_{-\omega}, \chi_\omega, \beta_\omega, \beta_{-\omega})$. We then introduced the BRST charge $Q = Q_D + Q_A + Q_{\mathcal{M}}$, (3.29), (3.33), (3.38), which is nilpotent. It is clear from the discussion above that cohomology groups are

$$H^0_{cl}(Q) = C(a_\omega, a_{-\omega}), \qquad H^n_{cl}(Q) = 0, \ \forall n \neq 0. \tag{3.43}$$

In other words, we have obtained a resolution of the classical phase space $C(a_\omega, a_{-\omega})$.

In the extended history phase space $\mathcal{HP}^*$, we can define a natural Hamiltonian as the generator of rigid time translations:

$$\mathcal{H} = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} k(i\phi_k\pi_{-k} + \phi^*_k\pi^*_{-k}) + i\omega\theta_\omega\chi_{-\omega} - i\omega\theta_{-\omega}\chi_\omega + \omega\beta_\omega\beta_{-\omega} \tag{3.44}$$

This Hamiltonian picks out the Fourier frequency k; for any monomial $A_kB_{k'}...$ on $\mathcal{HP}^*$, we have $[\mathcal{H}, A_kB_{k'}...] = (k + k' + ...)A_kB_{k'}...$. In particular, the BRST charge Q carries zero frequency, and hence it commutes with the Hamiltonian; $[\mathcal{H}, Q] = 0$. Hence the Hamiltonian acts in a well-defined manner on the cohomology groups. We verify that the Hamiltonian can be written as

$$\mathcal{H} = \omega a_\omega a_{-\omega} + \{Q, O\}, \tag{3.45}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} O &= \sum_{k^2 \neq \omega^2} \frac{ik}{(k^2 - \omega^2)} \phi^*_k \pi_{-k} \\ &\quad + i\omega(\theta_\omega \pi^*_{-\omega} - \theta_{-\omega}\pi^*_\omega) + \frac{1}{2}\beta_\omega \mathcal{M}_{-\omega}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.46}$$

In particular, on the zeroth cohomology $H^0_{cl}(Q) = C(a_\omega, a_{-\omega})$ it is equivalent to the operator $\mathcal{H} = \omega a_\omega a_{-\omega}$, which is (3.27).

3.4 Quantization

So far, our considerations were completely classical. The idea behind MCCQ is to quantize in the extended history phase space first, and impose the constraints by passing to cohomology afterwards. We quantize the theory by introducing a vacuum state $\big|0\big\rangle$ which is annihilated by all negative-frequency operators. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{-k}\big|0\big\rangle = \pi_{-k}\big|0\big\rangle = \phi^*_{-k}\big|0\big\rangle = \pi^*_{-k}\big|0\big\rangle = \\ \theta_{-\omega}\big|0\big\rangle = \chi_{-\omega}\big|0\big\rangle = \beta_{-\omega}\big|0\big\rangle = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{3.47}$$

Recall from (3.43) that the physical phase space could be identified with the classical cohomology $H^0_{cl}(Q) = C(a_\omega, a_{-\omega})$. Since all negative-frequency operators annihilate the vacuum, quantization leaves us with the state space $H^0_{st}(Q) = C(a_\omega)$, $H^n_{st}(Q) = 0$, $n \neq 0$. A basis for the state space $H^0_{st}(Q)$ is thus given by

$$\big|n\big\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n!}} a^n_\omega \big|0\big\rangle \tag{3.48}$$

An operator A is physical if $[Q, A] = 0$, and two physical operators A and A' are equivalent if $A' = A + [Q, B]$, B arbitrary. This is precisely the definition of the classical cohomology of Q, and hence the operator cohomology is given by $H^0_{op}(Q) = H^0_{cl}(Q) = C(a_\omega, a_{-\omega})$, $H^n_{op}(Q) = H^n_{cl}(Q) = 0$, $n \neq 0$.

The Hamiltonian commutes with the BRST charge, $[\mathcal{H}, Q] = 0$, and hence the energy of the n-quanta state (3.48) is given by

$$\mathcal{H}\big|n\big\rangle = n\omega\big|n\big\rangle. \tag{3.49}$$

Note the complete isomorphism between (3.7), (3.12), (3.13) and (3.41), (3.48), (3.49), provided that we identify

$$a_\omega = a^\dagger, \qquad a_{-\omega} = a. \tag{3.50}$$

This shows that the state space $H^0_{st}(Q)$ is isomorphic, as a linear space, to the Hilbert space of the harmonic oscillator, with the same energy eigenvalues.

The first major flaw in [9], the overcounting of states in the harmonic oscillator, has thus been corrected. This was done by introducing bosonic antifields θ_ω, $\theta_{-\omega}$, χ_ω, $\chi_{-\omega}$ to eliminate ϕ^*_ω, $\phi^*_{-\omega}$, π^*_ω, $\pi^*_{-\omega}$, and by introducing fermionic antifields β_ω, $\beta_{-\omega}$ to eliminate the constraints $\mathcal{M}_\omega$, $\mathcal{M}_{-\omega}$, i.e. to identify momenta and velocities.

3.5 Involution and cohomological description II

In the previous subsection we succeeded in constructing a resolution of the Hilbert space of the harmonic oscillator, *regarded as a linear space*. However, a Hilbert space is not just a linear space; it is a metric space equipped with an positive-definite inner product. In addition to the overcounting of states, which is a direct error, [9] has a serious omission: no attempt was made to construct the inner product.

Involution can be naturally defined in the history phase space as negation of frequency:

$$\begin{aligned} \phi^\dagger_k &= \phi_{-k}, & \pi^\dagger_k &= \pi_{-k}, \\ \phi^{*\dagger}_k &= \phi^*_{-k}, & \pi^{*\dagger}_k &= \pi^*_{-k}, \\ \theta^\dagger_{\pm\omega} &= \theta_{\mp\omega}, & \chi^\dagger_{\pm\omega} &= \chi_{\mp\omega}, \\ \beta^\dagger_{\pm\omega} &= \beta_{\mp\omega}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.51}$$

$Q^\dagger_D = Q_D$ and $Q^\dagger_A = Q_A$, but

$$Q^\dagger_M = \mathcal{M}_{-\omega}\beta_\omega \neq Q_\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_\omega\beta_{-\omega}. \tag{3.52}$$

The BRST operator is thus not selfadjoint, $Q^\dagger \neq Q$, which ruins the cohomological setup. The source of this problem is clearly that the $\mathcal{M}_{\pm\omega}$ constraints are second class, cf. (3.36). To make them first class, we employ a stardard trick. Introduce a new pair of canonically conjugate bosonic variables $\alpha_{\pm\omega}$, with nonzero brackets

$$[\alpha_\omega, \alpha_{-\omega}] = -2\omega. \tag{3.53}$$

We replace (3.35) by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}'_\omega = \mathcal{M}_\omega + \alpha_\omega &= \pi_\omega - i\omega\phi_\omega + \alpha_\omega, \\ \mathcal{M}'_{-\omega} = \mathcal{M}_{-\omega} + \alpha_{-\omega} &= \pi_{-\omega} + i\omega\phi_{-\omega} + \alpha_{-\omega}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.54}$$

which are first class: $[\mathcal{M}'_\omega, \mathcal{M}'_{-\omega}] = 0$. Consequently, the corresponding antifields must also be first class. To this end, we let the antifields $\beta_{\pm\omega}$ anticommute, and introduce their canonical momenta $\gamma_{\pm\omega}$. The brackets (3.37) are now replaced by

$$\begin{aligned} &\{\beta_\omega, \gamma_{-\omega}\} = \{\beta_{-\omega}, \gamma_\omega\} = 1, \\ &\{\beta_{\pm\omega}, \beta_{\pm\omega}\} = \{\gamma_{\pm\omega}, \gamma_{\pm\omega}\} = 0, \end{aligned} \tag{3.55}$$

and the BRST charge (3.38) by

$$Q'_M = \mathcal{M}'_\omega \gamma_{-\omega} + \mathcal{M}'_{-\omega}\gamma_\omega. \tag{3.56}$$

The relevant part of the BRST charge is $Q = Q_A + Q'_M$, which acts as follows on the modes with $k = \omega$:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta\phi_\omega &= -i\gamma_\omega, & \delta\pi_\omega &= -\omega\gamma_\omega, \\ \delta\phi^*_\omega &= 0, & \delta\pi^*_\omega &= \chi_\omega, \\ \delta\beta_\omega &= \mathcal{M}'_\omega, & \delta\gamma_\omega &= 0, \\ \delta\theta_\omega &= -i\phi^*_\omega, & \delta\chi_\omega &= 0, \\ \delta\alpha_\omega &= 2\omega\gamma_\omega, \end{aligned} \tag{3.57}$$

We note that $\delta\phi_\omega$, $\delta\pi_\omega$ and $\delta\alpha_\omega$ are all proportional to γ_ω. Two linearly independent combinations of these variables thus belong to the kernel, e.g. $\pi_\omega + i\omega\phi_\omega$ and $\mathcal{M}'_\omega$. Furthermore, ϕ^*_ω, γ_ω and χ_ω all belond to the kernel, so $\dim\ker Q = 5$. $\operatorname{im} Q$ is generated by $\mathcal{M}'_\omega$, ϕ^*_ω, γ_ω and χ_ω, and $\dim\operatorname{im} Q = 4$. Hence $\dim H^\bullet_{cl}(Q) = 1$. Since the action on modes with $k = -\omega$ is completely analogous, and Q_D eliminates all modes with $k^2 \neq \omega^2$, we find that $H^\bullet_{cl}(Q)$ is generated by

$$\begin{aligned} a_\omega &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\omega}}(\pi_w + i\omega\phi_\omega) + x\mathcal{M}'_\omega, \\ a_{-\omega} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\omega}}(\pi_{-\omega} - i\omega\phi_{-\omega}) + y\mathcal{M}'_{-\omega}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.58}$$

where x and y are arbitrary constants. Appending the involution rule (3.51) by

$$\beta^\dagger_{\pm\omega} = \beta_{\mp\omega}, \qquad \gamma^\dagger_{\pm\omega} = \gamma_{\mp\omega}, \qquad \alpha^\dagger_{\pm\omega} = \alpha_{\mp\omega}, \tag{3.59}$$

we see that the improved BRST charge $Q = Q_D + Q_A + Q'_M$ is indeed self-adjoint, $Q^\dagger = Q$.

To ensure that the Hamiltonian in $\mathcal{HP}^*$ still commutes with the BRST charge, we must give energy to the new modes; (3.44) must therefore be replaced by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H} &= \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} k(i\phi_k\pi_{-k} + \phi_k^*\pi_{-k}^*) + i\omega\theta_\omega\chi_{-\omega} - i\omega\theta_{-\omega}\chi_\omega \\ &\quad + \omega\beta_\omega\gamma_{-\omega} - \omega\beta_{-\omega}\gamma_\omega + \frac{1}{2}\alpha_\omega\alpha_{-\omega}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.60}$$

We have $[\mathcal{H}, Q] = 0$ and $\mathcal{H} = \omega a_\omega a_{-\omega} + \{Q, O\}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} O &= \sum_{k^2\neq\omega^2} \frac{ik}{(k^2-\omega^2)}\phi_k^*\pi_{-k} \\ &\quad + i\omega(\theta_\omega\pi_{-w}^* - \theta_{-\omega}\pi_\omega^*) + \frac{1}{2}(\beta_\omega\alpha_{-\omega} + \beta_{-\omega}\alpha_\omega) \\ &\quad + x(\beta_\omega\mathcal{M}_{-\omega} - \beta_{-\omega}\mathcal{M}_\omega). \end{aligned} \tag{3.61}$$

Equation (3.60) thus induces a well-defined Hamiltonian in cohomology.

3.6 Cohomological description III

The separation of the second-class constraints into first class constraints plus gauge conditions is not unique. In this subsection we illustrate this with a non-minimal cohomological formulation of the harmonic oscillator.

Introduce new bosonic fields ψ_k with canonical conjugates ρ_k, defined for all $k \in \mathbb{R}$. For $k^2 \neq \omega^2$ we define the dynamics and momentum constraints

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_k &= (k^2-\omega^2)(\phi_k + \psi_k), \\ \mathcal{M}_k &= \pi_k - ik\phi_k - \rho_k - ik\psi_k, \end{aligned} \tag{3.62}$$

and for $k = \pm\omega$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_{\pm\omega} &= 0, \\ \mathcal{M}'_{\pm\omega} &= \pi_{\pm\omega} \mp i\omega\phi_{\pm\omega} + \alpha_{\pm\omega} \\ &= \mathcal{M}_{\pm\omega} + \rho_{\pm\omega} \pm i\omega\psi_{\pm\omega} + \alpha_{\pm\omega}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.63}$$

The bosonic fields ψ_k, ρ_k satisfy the nonzero CCR $[\psi_k, \rho_{k'}] = i\delta_{k+k'}$, and $\alpha_{\pm\omega}$ still satisfy (3.53). Moreover, we have to introduce new fermionic antifields $\kappa_{\pm\omega}$ and their momenta $\lambda_{\pm\omega}$, with the nonzero brackets $\{\kappa_\omega, \lambda_{-\omega}\} = \{\kappa_{-\omega}, \lambda_\omega\} = 1$.

The BRST charge is

$$\begin{aligned} Q &= \sum_k \big(\mathcal{E}_k\pi^*_{-k} + \mathcal{M}_k\gamma_{-k}\big) + (\rho_\omega + i\omega\psi_\omega + \alpha_\omega)\gamma_{-\omega} \\ &\quad + \phi^*_\omega\chi_{-\omega} + \psi_\omega\lambda_{-\omega} + \omega \leftrightarrow -\omega. \end{aligned} \tag{3.64}$$

It acts on functions $F \in C(\mathcal{HP}^*)$ as $\delta F = [Q, F]$. For $k^2 \neq \omega^2$, the action on the basis vectors reads

$$\begin{aligned} \delta\phi_k &= -i\gamma_k, & \delta\pi_k &= i(k^2-\omega^2)\pi^*_k - k\gamma_k, \\ \delta\psi_k &= i\gamma_k, & \delta\rho_k &= i(k^2-\omega^2)\pi^*_k - k\gamma_k, \\ \delta\phi^*_k &= \mathcal{E}_k, & \delta\pi^*_k &= 0, \\ \delta\beta_k &= \mathcal{M}_k, & \delta\gamma_k &= 0. \end{aligned} \tag{3.65}$$

$\ker Q$ is generated by $\phi_k + \psi_k$, $\pi_k - \rho_k$, π^*_k and γ_k. $\operatorname{im} Q$ is generated by $\mathcal{E}_k$, $\mathcal{M}_k$, π^*_k and γ_k. Since $\dim\ker Q = \dim\operatorname{im} Q = 4$, $\dim H^\bullet = 0$ and there is no contribution to cohomology for such k.

For $k^2 = \omega^2$, say $k = \omega$, we have instead

$$\begin{aligned} \delta\phi_\omega &= -i\gamma_\omega, & \delta\pi_\omega &= -\omega\gamma_\omega, \\ \delta\phi^*_\omega &= 0, & \delta\pi^*_\omega &= \chi_\omega, \\ \delta\psi_\omega &= 0, & \delta\rho_\omega &= i\lambda_\omega, \\ \delta\beta_\omega &= \mathcal{M}'_\omega, & \delta\gamma_\omega &= 0, \\ \delta\kappa_\omega &= \psi_\omega, & \delta\lambda_\omega &= 0, \\ \delta\theta_\omega &= -i\phi^*_\omega, & \delta\chi_\omega &= 0, \\ \delta\alpha_\omega &= 2\omega\gamma_\omega, \end{aligned} \tag{3.66}$$

This is the same as in (3.57), except for the additional quadruple ψ_ω, ρ_ω, κ_ω, λ_ω, which cancels in cohomology (ψ_ω and λ_ω are exact and ρ_ω and κ_ω are not closed). The cohomology is thus the same as in the previous section. To the Hamiltonian in (3.60) we must add terms which give energy to the new fields, i.e.

$$\Delta\mathcal{H} = i\omega\psi_\omega\rho_{-\omega} + \omega\kappa_\omega\lambda_{-\omega} - \omega \leftrightarrow -\omega. \tag{3.67}$$

It is impossible to construct the correct phase space algebra $C(\mathcal{P}) = C(a, a^\dagger)$ in terms of fields and antifields which depend on k only; we must also introduce antifields which are explicitly labelled by the solutions $\pm\omega$. In the field theory context, it means that the momentum constraint is bound to break manifest covariance. To see this, it suffices to count the degrees of freedom. Assume for simplicity that the history fields ϕ_k only have finitely many component, i.e. k belongs to a finite but large set with N elements. In the previous subsection, we introduced antifields and momenta with the following number of components, where fermions count negative:

Field	# comp	Momentum	# comp
ϕ_k	N	π_k	N
ϕ^*_k	$-N$	π^*_k	$-N$
$\beta_{\pm\omega}$	-2	$\gamma_{\pm\omega}$	-2
$\theta_{\pm\omega}$	2	$\chi_{\pm\omega}$	2
$\alpha_{\pm\omega}$	2		

(3.68)

Hence $\dim H^0_{cl}(Q) = 2N - 2N - 4 + 4 + 2 = 2$, which is the correct dimension for the physical phase space spanned by a and $a^\dagger$. We can introduce additional antifields, like β_k and γ_k in this subsection, but then they must be cancelled by two other antifields ψ_k and ρ_k with $2N$ components. At the end, the balance is always maintained by the two components of $\alpha_{\pm\omega}$.

A similar conclusion holds generally, both for interacting theories and field theories, as discussed in subsection 10.2.

3.7 Continuous Fourier variable

In the previous subsections the Fourier variable k was assumed to be discrete. The precise domain of k was unimportant, as long as $\pm\omega$ belongs to this domain. In this subsection we will take the formal continuum limit of the cohomological formulation in subsection 3.5. This mainly amounts to replacing sums by integrals, but there is a slight complication: the infinite constant $\delta(0)$ enters in some formulas. This problem is purely formal, and we will ignore it henceforth.

The dynamics and momentum constraints read

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}(k) &= (k^2 - \omega^2)\phi(k), \\ \mathcal{M}(k) &= \pi(k) - ik\phi(k) + \alpha(k), \end{aligned} \tag{3.69}$$

where

$$[\alpha(k), \alpha(k')] = -2k\delta(k + k'). \tag{3.70}$$

However, $\mathcal{M}(k)$ is only defined for $k^2 = \omega^2$, and so is $\alpha(k)$. We note that $[\mathcal{M}(k), \mathcal{M}(k')] = 0$, and $[\mathcal{M}(k), \mathcal{E}(k')] = 0$, provided that $k^2 = \omega^2$, which is the case. Introduce antifields $\phi^*(k)$ for all k, and additional antifields $\theta(k)$ and $\beta(k)$ for $k^2 = \omega^2$, and their canonical momenta. The complete list of nonzero CCRs is

$$\begin{aligned} [\phi(k), \pi(k')] &= i\delta(k+k'), \qquad \{\phi^*(k), \pi^*(k')\} = \delta(k+k'), \\ [\theta(k), \chi(k')] &= i\delta(k+k'), \qquad \{\beta(k), \gamma(k')\} = \delta(k+k'), \\ [\alpha(k), \alpha(k')] &= -2k\delta(k+k'). \end{aligned} \tag{3.71}$$

The BRST charge $Q = Q_D + Q_A + Q_{\mathcal{M}}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} Q_D &= \int dk\ \mathcal{E}(k)\pi^*(-k), \\ Q_A &= \int dk\ \phi^*(k)\chi(-k)\delta(k^2-\omega^2) \\ &= \frac{1}{2\omega}\big(\phi^*(\omega)\chi(-\omega) + \phi^*(-\omega)\chi(\omega)\big), \\ Q_{\mathcal{M}} &= \int dk\ \mathcal{M}(k)\gamma(-k)\delta(k^2-\omega^2) \\ &= \frac{1}{2\omega}\Big(\mathcal{M}(\omega)\gamma(-\omega) + \mathcal{M}(-\omega)\gamma(\omega)\Big), \end{aligned} \tag{3.72}$$

acts on the variables defined for all k as

$$\begin{aligned} \delta\phi(k) &= -i\gamma(k)\delta(k^2-\omega^2), \\ \delta\pi(k) &= i(k^2-\omega^2)\pi^*(k) - k\gamma(k)\delta(k^2-\omega^2), \\ \delta\phi^*(k) &= (k^2-\omega^2)\phi(k), \\ \delta\pi^*(k) &= \chi(k)\delta(k^2-\omega^2), \end{aligned} \tag{3.73}$$

and on the variables defined for $k^2 = \omega^2$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \delta\beta(k) &= \mathcal{M}(k)\delta(k^2-\omega^2), \\ \delta\gamma(k) &= 0, \\ \delta\theta(k) &= -i\phi^*(k)\delta(k^2-\omega^2), \\ \delta\chi(k) &= 0, \\ \delta\alpha(k) &= 2k\gamma(k)\delta(k^2-\omega^2). \end{aligned} \tag{3.74}$$

The cohomology is computed as in subsection 3.5. For $k \neq \pm\omega$, $\phi(k)$ and $\pi^*(k)$ belong to both the kernel and the image, and $\pi(k)$ and $\phi^*(k)$ to neither; hence $H^\bullet_{cl}(Q) = 0$. For $k^2 = \omega^2$, $k = \omega$ say, the BRST charge acts like in (3.57), except that the RHS is multiplied by the infinite constant $\delta(k^2-\omega^2) \propto \delta(0)$, e.g.

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta\phi(\omega) &= -i\gamma(\omega)\delta(0), \\
\delta\alpha(\omega) &= 2\omega\gamma(\omega)\delta(0).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.75}$$

We will consider $\delta(k^2-\omega^2)$ simply as a non-zero constant, and ignore that it is infinite when $k = \pm\omega$. The cohomology is then generated by a_ω and $a_{-\omega}$ as in (3.58). The Hamiltonian in $\mathcal{HP}^*$ is

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{H} \;=\; \int dk\, \Big(& ik\phi(k)\pi(-k) + k\phi^*(k)\pi^*(-k) \qquad (3.76) \\
& + \big(ik\theta(k)\chi(-k) + k\beta(k)\gamma(-k) + \frac{1}{2}\alpha(k)\alpha(-k)\big)\delta(k^2-\omega^2)\Big),
\end{aligned}$$

We have $[\mathcal{H}, Q] = 0$ and $\mathcal{H} = \omega a_\omega a_{-\omega} + \{Q, O\}$, where and O is some operator.

3.8 Time-plane formulation

It is instructive to write down the formalism in the time-plane. The dynamics constraint becomes

$$\mathcal{E}(x) = \phi''(x) + \omega^2\phi(x) \approx 0. \tag{3.77}$$

The following identities hold:

$$\int dx\ \mathrm{e}^{i\omega x}\mathcal{E}(x) = \int dx\ \mathrm{e}^{-i\omega x}\mathcal{E}(x) = 0. \tag{3.78}$$

We introduce the conjugate momentum $\pi(x)$, the continuous antifield $\phi^*(x)$, and its canonical momentum $\pi^*(x)$; the nonzero brackets are

$$[\phi(x), \pi(x')] = i\delta(x-x'), \qquad \{\phi^*(x), \pi^*(x')\} = \delta(x-x'). \tag{3.79}$$

As in section 3.5, we also introduce the discrete antifields $\theta_{\pm\omega}$, $\beta_{\pm\omega}$ and α_ω with momenta $\chi_{\mp\omega}$, $\gamma_{\mp\omega}$ and $\alpha_{-\omega}$, respectively. The BRST charge is $Q = Q_D + Q_A + Q_{\mathcal{M}}$, where

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_D &= \int dx\ (\phi''(x) + \omega^2\phi(x))\pi^*(x), \\
Q_A &= \chi_{-\omega}\int dx\ \mathrm{e}^{i\omega x}\phi^*(x) + \chi_\omega\int dx\ \mathrm{e}^{-i\omega x}\phi^*(x), \\
Q_{\mathcal{M}} &= \mathcal{M}_\omega\gamma_{-\omega} + \mathcal{M}_{-\omega}\gamma_\omega, \\
\mathcal{M}_{\pm\omega} &= \alpha_{\pm\omega} + \int dx\ \mathrm{e}^{\pm i\omega x}(\pi(x) - \phi'(x)).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.80}$$

The cohomology $H^\bullet_{cl}(Q)$ is generated by

$$\begin{aligned} a_\omega &= x_\omega \mathcal{M}_\omega + \int dx\ \mathrm{e}^{i\omega x}(\pi(x) + \phi'(x)), \\ a_{-\omega} &= x_{-\omega} \mathcal{M}_{-\omega} + \int dx\ \mathrm{e}^{-i\omega x}(\pi(x) + \phi'(x)), \end{aligned} \tag{3.81}$$

where x_ω and $x_{-\omega}$ are arbitrary constants. The Hamiltonian in $\mathcal{HP}^*$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H} &= \int dx\ (i\phi'(x)\pi(x) + \frac{d}{dx}\phi^*(x)\pi^*(x)) \\ &\quad + \omega(\beta_\omega \gamma_{-\omega} - \beta_{-\omega}\gamma_\omega) + \frac{1}{2}\alpha_\omega \alpha_{-\omega}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.82}$$

can be written as $\mathcal{H} = \omega a_\omega a_{-\omega} + \{Q, O\}$, for some operator O. Involution sends

$$\begin{aligned} \phi^\dagger(x) &= \phi(x), \qquad & \pi^\dagger(x) &= \pi(x), \\ \phi^{*\dagger}(x) &= \phi^*(x), \qquad & \pi^{*\dagger}(x) &= \pi^*(x), \end{aligned} \tag{3.83}$$

whereas the involution of the discrete variables is as in (3.51). Q is clearly invariant under this transformation.

4 The free particle

4.1 Cohomological construction

The free particle moving in d-dimensional space is described by d harmonic oscillators with zero frequency. It will become of considerable interest below, as it describes the observer's trajectory in QJT. Anticipating this application, we denote the independent time parameter by t, the histories by $q^\mu(t)$, and the history momentum $p_\mu(t)$, subject to non-zero CCR

$$[q^\mu(t), p_\nu(t')] = i\delta^\mu_\nu \delta(t - t'). \tag{4.1}$$

We work in Minkowski space with a flat, background metric $\eta_{\mu\nu}$ with inverse $\eta^{\mu\nu}$, which we freely use to raise and lower indices, e.g. $q_\mu(t) = \eta_{\mu\nu}q^\nu(t)$, $p^\mu(t) = \eta^{\mu\nu}p_\nu(t)$.

The equations of motion read

$$\mathcal{E}^\mu(t) = \ddot{q}^\mu(t) \approx 0. \tag{4.2}$$

To implement these in cohomology, we introduce fermionic antifields $q_*^\mu(t)$ with momenta $p_\mu^*(t)$, satisfying non-zero brackets

$$\{q_*^\mu(t), p_\nu^*(t')\} = \delta_\nu^\mu \delta(t-t'). \tag{4.3}$$

The equations (4.2) are subject to the redundancies

$$\int dt\ \mathcal{E}^\mu(t) = \int dt\ t\,\mathcal{E}^\mu(t) \equiv 0, \tag{4.4}$$

which require that we introduce two new, bosonic antifields θ_1^μ and θ_0^μ with momenta χ_1^μ and χ_0^μ. We assume that the integral in (4.4) vanishes if the integrand is a total derivative.

Moreover, we need to identify momenta and velocities, which is accomplished by the momentum constraint

$$\mathcal{M}_\mu(t) = p_\mu(t) - \dot{q}_\mu(t). \tag{4.5}$$

Most of the momentum constraints do not commute with dynamics, because

$$[\mathcal{M}_\mu(t), \mathcal{E}^\nu(t')] = -i\delta_\mu^\nu \ddot{\delta}(t-t'). \tag{4.6}$$

However, integrating by parts we immediately see that the expressions

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{M}_\mu^0 &= \int dt\ \mathcal{M}_\mu(t) = \int dt\ p_\mu(t), \\
\mathcal{M}_\mu^1 &= \int dt\ t\,\mathcal{M}_\mu(t) \approx \int dt\ t\,p_\mu(t).
\end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

do commute with $\mathcal{E}^\nu(t')$. Here we used that

$$\int dt\ t\,\dot{q}^\mu(t) = \delta(-\frac{1}{2}\int dt\ t^2\,q_*^\mu(t)) \tag{4.8}$$

is BRST exact in view of the dynamics constraint (4.2), and thus it can be ignored. A novel feature compared to the harmonic oscillator is that the momentum constraints are first class, because

$$[\mathcal{M}_\mu^0, \mathcal{M}_\nu^1] = 0. \tag{4.9}$$

After the dynamics and antifield constraints have been implemented, four degrees of freedom remain: the two solutions to $\ddot{q}^\mu(t) = 0$ and their associated momenta. The task of the momentum constraints is to identify velocities and momenta, and thus to cut down the number of degrees of freedom to two. This would be accomplished by two second class constraints. However, $\mathcal{M}^0_\mu$ and $\mathcal{M}^1_\mu$ are first class and count twice. Hence only of them can be implemented in cohomology.

Collecting everything, the extended history phase space $\mathcal{HP}^*$ is spanned by the following fields, antifields, and canonical momenta:

Field	Momentum	Parity	Constraint
$q^\mu(t)$	$p_\mu(t)$	B	
$q^\mu_*(t)$	$p^*_\mu(t)$	F	$\mathcal{E}^\mu(t) = \ddot{q}^\mu(t)$
θ^μ_1	χ^1_μ	B	$\int dt\ q^\mu_*(t)$
θ^μ_0	χ^0_μ	B	$\int dt\ t\, q^\mu_*(t)$
β^0_μ	γ^μ_0	F	$\mathcal{M}^0_\mu$
β^1_μ	γ^μ_1	F	$\mathcal{M}^1_\mu$

where only one of the antifields β^0_μ and β^1_μ are used. The total BRST operator is $Q_q = Q_d + Q_a + Q_m$, where

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_d &= \int dt\ \ddot{q}^\mu(t) p^*_\mu(t), \\
Q_a &= \chi^1_\mu \int dt\ q^\mu_*(t) + \chi^0_\mu \int dt\ t\, q^\mu_*(t), \\
Q_m &= \begin{cases} \mathcal{M}^0_\mu \gamma^\mu_0, & \text{or} \\ \mathcal{M}^1_\mu \gamma^\mu_1. \end{cases}
\end{aligned} \tag{4.10}$$

The analysis becomes simpler if we expand all fields in a Taylor series, to which we turn next.

4.2 Mode expansion

We assume that all fields can be expanded in a Laurent series in t, and define the modes q^μ_m and p^m_μ by

$$\begin{aligned}
q^\mu(t) &= \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} q^\mu_m t^m, \\
p_\mu(t) &= \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} p^m_\mu t^{-m-1}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.11}$$

The Laurent modes satisfy the non-zero brackets

$$[q^\mu_m, p^n_\nu] = -i\delta^\mu_\nu \delta^n_m. \tag{4.12}$$

Using the expansion of the delta function around $s = 1$,

$$\delta(1-s) = \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} s^m \tag{4.13}$$

and that

$$\delta(t-t') = -\frac{1}{t'}\delta(1-\frac{t}{t'}), \tag{4.14}$$

we find that the definition (4.12) leads to the correct CCR (4.1) for the fields (4.11). The modes can be recovered from the fields by taking moments, e.g.

$$q^\mu_m = \int dt\ t^{-1-m} q^\mu(t). \tag{4.15}$$

In particular, q^μ_{-1} is the residue.

The dynamics constraint takes the form

$$\mathcal{E}^\mu_m = (m+2)(m+1)q^\mu_{m+2}. \tag{4.16}$$

Hence we introduce an antifield $q^{*\mu}_m$ with momentum $p^m_{*\mu}$ and nonzero brackets $\{q^{*\mu}_m, p^n_{*\nu}\} = \delta^\mu_\nu \delta^n_m$, and define the dynamics constraint

$$Q_d = \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} \mathcal{E}^\mu_m p^m_{*\mu} = \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} m(m-1) q^\mu_m p^{m-2}_{*\mu}. \tag{4.17}$$

Q_d acts like

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_d q^\mu_m &= 0, & \delta_d p^m_\mu &= -im(m-1)p^{m-2}_{*\mu}, \\ \delta_d q^{*\mu}_m &= (m+2)(m+1)q^\mu_{m+2}, & \delta_d p^m_{*\mu} &= 0. \end{aligned} \tag{4.18}$$

$\ker Q_d$ is generated by all q^μ_m, $q^{*\mu}_{-2}$, $q^{*\mu}_{-1}$, p^0_μ, p^1_μ and all $p^m_{*\mu}$. $\operatorname{im} Q_d$ is generated by all q^μ_m except $m = 0$ and $m = 1$, and by all $p^m_{*\mu}$ except $m = -2$ and $m = -1$. $H^\bullet_{cl}(Q_d)$ is hence generated by q^μ_0, q^μ_1, $q^{*\mu}_{-2}$, $q^{*\mu}_{-1}$, p^0_μ, p^1_μ, $p^{-2}_{*\mu}$ and $p^{-1}_{*\mu}$.

The antifields constraints correspond to

$$q^{*\mu}_{-1} = \int dt\ q^\mu_*(t), \qquad q^{*\mu}_{-2} = \int dt\ t\, q^\mu_*(t). \tag{4.19}$$

To kill the antifields in cohomology, we introduce new bosonic antifields θ^μ_1, θ^μ_0 and their momenta χ^1_μ, χ^0_μ. The antifield BRST charge,

$$Q_a = q^{*\mu}_{-1}\chi^1_\mu + q^{*\mu}_{-2}\chi^0_\mu, \tag{4.20}$$

acts on the relevant fields as

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_a q^{*\mu}_{-1} = \delta_a q^{*\mu}_{-2} = 0, \quad \delta_a p^{-1}_{*\mu} = \chi^1_\mu, \quad \delta_a p^{-2}_{*\mu} = \chi^0_\mu, \\ \delta_a \theta^\mu_1 = q^{*\mu}_{-1}, \quad \delta_a \theta^\mu_0 = q^{*\mu}_{-2}, \quad \delta_a \chi^1_\mu = \delta_a \chi^0_\mu = 0.\end{aligned} \tag{4.21}$$

It is clear that the antifields cancel in quadruplets, and $H^\bullet_{cl}(Q_d + Q_a)$ is thus generated by q^μ_m and p^m_μ, $m = 0, 1$.

The modes of the momentum constraints read

$$\mathcal{M}^m_\mu = p^m_\mu + m\eta_{\mu\nu} q^\nu_{m+1}, \tag{4.22}$$

for $m = 0, 1$. They commute with $\mathcal{E}^\mu_m$:

$$[\mathcal{M}^m_\mu, \mathcal{E}^\nu_n] = im(m-1)\delta^\nu_\mu \delta^m_{n+2} = 0. \tag{4.23}$$

Moreover, since $q^\mu_{-1} = \delta(1/2 q^{*\mu}_{-3}) \approx 0$, we can take the momentum constraints to be

$$\mathcal{M}^0_\mu = p^0_\mu, \qquad \text{or} \qquad \mathcal{M}^1_\mu = p^1_\mu. \tag{4.24}$$

$\mathcal{M}^0_\mu$ and $\mathcal{M}^1_\mu$ commute, and hence they are first class constraints. We can therefore only hope to implement one of them in cohomology.

To implement $\mathcal{M}^0_\mu \approx 0$, we introduce a pair of antifields β^0_μ and γ^μ_0, and the momentum part of the BRST operator becomes

$$Q_m \equiv Q^0_m = p^0_\mu \gamma^\mu_0. \tag{4.25}$$

It acts on the relevant fields as

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_m q^\mu_0 = i\gamma^\mu_0, \qquad & \delta_m p^0_\mu = \delta_m q^\mu_1 = \delta_m p^1_\mu = 0, \\ \delta_m \beta^\mu_0 = p^0_\mu \qquad & \delta_m \gamma^0_\mu = 0.\end{aligned} \tag{4.26}$$

The quadruplet q^μ_0, p^0_μ, β^μ_0 and γ^0_μ cancels, and the cohomology is generated by

$$\begin{aligned} u_\mu &= q^1_\mu + x p^0_\mu, \\ s_\mu &= p^1_\mu, \end{aligned} \tag{4.27}$$

for some constant x. The brackets

$$[s_\mu, u_\nu] = i\eta_{\mu\nu}, \tag{4.28}$$

are well defined in $H^\bullet_{cl}(Q^0_m)$, i.e. independent of x.

Alternatively, we could implement $\mathcal{M}^1_\mu \approx 0$ in cohomology. We then introduce a pair of antifields β^1_μ and γ^μ_1, and the momentum part of the BRST operator becomes

$$Q_m \equiv Q^1_m = p^1_\mu \gamma^\mu_1. \tag{4.29}$$

It acts on the relevant fields as

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_m q^\mu_1 &= i\gamma^\mu_1, \qquad & \delta_m p^1_\mu &= \delta_m q^\mu_0 = \delta_m p^0_\mu = 0, \\ \delta_m \beta^\mu_1 &= p^1_\mu & \delta_m \gamma^1_\mu &= 0. \end{aligned} \tag{4.30}$$

The quadruplet q^μ_1, p^1_μ, β^μ_1 and γ^1_μ cancels, and the cohomology is generated by

$$\begin{aligned} s_\mu &= q^0_\mu + x p^1_\mu, \\ u_\mu &= p^0_\mu, \end{aligned} \tag{4.31}$$

for some constant x. The brackets

$$[s_\mu, u_\nu] = -i\eta_{\mu\nu}, \tag{4.32}$$

are well defined in $H^\bullet_{cl}(Q^1_m)$, i.e. independent of x.

4.3 Involution and quantization

Three different notions of involution are conceivable.

1. $m \to 1-m$, e.g. $q^\mu_m \to q^\mu_{1-m}$ and $p^m_\mu \to p^{1-m}_\mu$. Then

$$Q^0_m \to Q^1_m \to Q^0_m, \qquad q^\mu(t) \to t q^\mu(\frac{1}{t}), \qquad p_\mu(t) \to \frac{1}{t} p_\mu(\frac{1}{t}). \tag{4.33}$$

Since the momentum part of the BRST operator is not invariant, this notion of involution leads to difficulties for quantization.

2. $m \to -m$, e.g. $q^\mu_m \to q^\mu_{-m}$ and $p^m_\mu \to p^{-m}_\mu$. Then

$$Q^0_m \to Q^0_m, \qquad q^\mu(t) \to q^\mu(\frac{1}{t}), \qquad p_\mu(t) \to p_\mu(\frac{1}{t}). \tag{4.34}$$

Since Q^0_m is invariant under involution, we choose it as the momentum part of the BRST operator, and the corresponding vacuum $\big|0\big\rangle$ in $\mathcal{HP}^*$ annihilates all modes with $m < 0$, e.g. $q^\mu_{-m}\big|0\big\rangle = p^{-m}_\mu\big|0\big\rangle = 0$ for all $-m < 0$. We must also decide whether q^μ_0 or p^0_μ should annihilate the vacuum.

3. $m \to 2-m$, e.g. $q^\mu_m \to q^\mu_{2-m}$ and $p^m_\mu \to p^{2-m}_\mu$. Then

$$Q^1_m \to Q^1_m, \qquad q^\mu(t) \to t^2 q^\mu(\frac{1}{t}), \qquad p_\mu(t) \to \frac{1}{t^2} p_\mu(\frac{1}{t}). \tag{4.35}$$

Since Q^1_m is invariant under involution, we choose it as the momentum part of the BRST operator, and the corresponding vacuum $\big|0\big\rangle$ in $\mathcal{HP}^*$ annihilates all modes with $m < 1$, e.g. $q^\mu_{-m}\big|0\big\rangle = p^{-m}_\mu\big|0\big\rangle = 0$ for all $-m \leqslant 0$. We must also decide whether q^μ_1 or p^1_μ should annihilate the vacuum.

4.4 Scale symmetry

Scale transformations are generated by the dilatations $D = td/dt$, which satisfy the one-dimensional abelian algebra $[D, D] = 0$. To fix notation, let us recall some basic facts about representations of the scaling group. A constant operator A has weight λ if it transforms under dilatations as

$$[D, A] = -\lambda A. \tag{4.36}$$

We write $\mathrm{wt}\, A = \lambda$. The weight is preserved by brackets; if $\mathrm{wt}\, A = \lambda_A$ and $\mathrm{wt}\, B = \lambda_B$, $\mathrm{wt}\, [A, B] = \lambda_A + \lambda_B$. A function $\phi(t)$ has weight λ if it transforms as

$$[D, \phi(t)] = -t\dot\phi(t) - \lambda\phi(t) = \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} -(m+\lambda)\phi_m t^m. \tag{4.37}$$

Again we write $\mathrm{wt}\, \phi(t) = \lambda$. We see that the mode ϕ_m has weight $m + \lambda$ in the sense (4.36). If $\mathrm{wt}\, \phi(t) = \lambda$, then $\mathrm{wt}\, \dot\phi(t) = \lambda + 1$, and more generally $\mathrm{wt}\, d^m\phi/dt^m = \lambda + m$. Moreover, if $\mathrm{wt}\, \phi(t) = \lambda$, then its m:th moment is a constant operator and $\mathrm{wt}\, (\int dt\ t^m \phi(t)) = \lambda - m - 1$ in the sense (4.36). In particular, the residue $\int dt\ t^{-1+\lambda}\phi(t)$ is invariantly defined.

If $\pi(t)$ is canonical conjugate to $\phi(t)$, i.e. $[\phi(t), \pi(t')] = i\delta(t - t')$, then $\mathrm{wt}\, \pi(t) = 1 - \lambda$. For the corresponding modes, $\mathrm{wt}\, \pi^m = -m - \lambda$. This is compatible with the brackets, because if

$$[D, \phi_m] = -(m+\lambda)\phi_m, \qquad [D, \pi^m] = (m+\lambda)\pi^m, \tag{4.38}$$

then $[D, [\phi_m, \pi^n]] = 0 = [D, -i\delta^n_m]$.

Dilatations act on the fields and momenta according to the following table:

Field	λ	Momentum	λ	Constraint	λ
$q^\mu(t)$	0	$p_\mu(t)$	1		
q^μ_m	m	p^m_μ	$-m$		
$q^\mu_*(t)$	2	$p^*_\mu(t)$	-1	$\ddot{q}^\mu(t)$	2
$q^{*\mu}_m$	$m+2$	$p^m_{*\mu}$	$-m-2$	$(m+2)(m+1)q^\mu_{m+2}$	$m+2$
θ^μ_0	0	χ^0_μ	0	$q^{*\mu}_{-2} = \int dt\; t\, q^\mu_*(t)$	0
θ^μ_1	1	χ^1_μ	-1	$q^{*\mu}_{-1} = \int dt\; q^\mu_*(t)$	1
β^0_μ	0	γ^μ_0	0	$\mathcal{M}^0_\mu = p^0_\mu$	0
β^1_μ	-1	γ^μ_1	1	$\mathcal{M}^1_\mu = p^1_\mu$	-1

Thus, the indices in (4.17), (4.20), (4.25) and (4.29) equal the weight of the corresponding mode, except for $q^{*\mu}_m$ which is shifted by two units. Hence $\mathrm{wt}\, Q = 0$, and the weight is preserved by the BRST charge.

4.5 Energy-momentum tensor

The energy-momentum tensor

$$T(t) = \eta_{\mu\nu}\dot{q}^\mu(t)\dot{q}^\nu(t) \tag{4.39}$$

is preserved by time evolution; $\dot{T}(t) = 0$ when the equations of motion $\ddot{q}^\mu(t) = 0$ are taken into account. In the present framework, this is expressed by noting that the time derivative $\dot{T}(t)$ is BRST exact, which is straightforward to verify:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{T}(t) &= 2\eta_{\mu\nu}\ddot{q}^\mu(t)\dot{q}^\nu(t) = \delta U(t), \\ U(t) &= 2\eta_{\mu\nu}q^\mu_*(t)\dot{q}^\nu(t). \end{aligned} \tag{4.40}$$

Using that $\dot{q}^\mu_m = (m+1)q^\mu_{m+1}$, the modes of the energy-momentum tensor become

$$T_m = \eta_{\mu\nu} \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} (n+1)(m-n+1)q^\mu_{n+1}q^\mu_{m-n+1}. \tag{4.41}$$

One verifies that T_m is BRST closed, and that $(m+1)T_{m+1} = \delta U_m$, where

$$U_m = 2\eta_{\mu\nu} \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} (m-n)q^{*\mu}_{n+1}q^\nu_{m-n}. \tag{4.42}$$

Hence T_m is BRST exact, except for

$$T_0 = \eta_{\mu\nu} \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} n(2-n) q^\mu_n q^\nu_{2-n}, \tag{4.43}$$

which thus belongs to cohomology.

We check that the weights match.

$$\begin{array}{c|cccc|cccc} \text{Field} & q^\mu(t) & T(t) & q^\mu_*(t) & U(t) & q^\mu_m & T_m & q^{*\mu}_m & U_m \\ \hline \text{Weight} & 0 & 2 & 2 & 3 & m & m+2 & m+2 & m+3 \end{array} \tag{4.44}$$

Since $\operatorname{wt} T(t) = 2$, the physical operator T_0 equals the residue

$$T_0 = \int dt\ t^{-1} T(t). \tag{4.45}$$

Thus it acts in a well-defined manner on the physical Hilbert space. For reasons that will become apparent below, we refer to the T_0 eigenvalue as *the observer's mass* squared and denote it by M^2_{obs}.

4.6 Hamiltonian

Since the Hamiltonian is the generator of rigid time translations, we are tempted to define the Hamiltonian in $\mathcal{HP}^*$ as

$$\mathcal{H}_0 = \int dt\ \dot{q}^\mu(t) p_\mu(t) - i \int dt\ \dot{q}^\mu_*(t) p^*_\mu(t). \tag{4.46}$$

This definition would lead to the expected time evolution

$$\begin{aligned} {[\mathcal{H}_0, q^\mu(t)]} &= -i\dot{q}^\mu(t), & [\mathcal{H}_0, p_\mu(t)] &= -i\dot{p}_\mu(t), \\ {[\mathcal{H}_0, q^\mu_*(t)]} &= -i\dot{q}^\mu_*(t), & [\mathcal{H}_0, p^*_\mu(t)] &= -i\dot{p}^*_\mu(t). \end{aligned} \tag{4.47}$$

However, $\mathcal{H}_0$ does not commute with the BRST operator. Namely, because

$$\begin{aligned} {[\mathcal{H}_0, \int dt\ q^\mu_*(t)]} = 0, &\qquad [\mathcal{H}_0, \int dt\ t\, q^\mu_*(t)] = i \int dt\ q^\mu_*(t), \\ {[\mathcal{H}_0, \mathcal{M}^0_\mu]} = 0, &\qquad [\mathcal{H}_0, \mathcal{M}^1_\mu] = i\mathcal{M}^0_\mu, \end{aligned} \tag{4.48}$$

we find

$$\begin{aligned} {[\mathcal{H}_0, Q_d]} &= 0, \\ {[\mathcal{H}_0, Q_a]} &= i\chi^1_\mu \int dt\ q^\mu_*(t), \\ {[\mathcal{H}_0, Q_m]} &= i\mathcal{M}^0 \gamma^\mu_1. \end{aligned} \tag{4.49}$$

To cancel these contributions, we add an extra term to the Hamiltonian:

$$\mathcal{H}_1 = \chi^1_\mu \theta^\mu_1 + i\gamma^\mu_1 \beta^0_\mu. \tag{4.50}$$

One verifies that the total Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_0 + \mathcal{H}_1$ does commute with the BRST charge $Q_q = Q_d + Q_a + Q_m$. It is therefore well defined on the cohomology $H^\bullet_{cl}(Q_q)$.

The Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_0 + \mathcal{H}_1$ translates into

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_0 &= -i \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} (m+1) q^\mu_{m+1} p^m_\mu + \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} (m+1) q^{*\mu}_{m+1} p^m_{*\mu} \\ &\quad + i\theta^\mu_0 \chi^{-2}_\mu - \beta^0_\mu \gamma^\mu_1. \end{aligned} \tag{4.51}$$

$\mathcal{H}_0$ acts on the modes as

$$\begin{array}{rl} [\mathcal{H}_0, q^\mu_m] = (m+1) q^\mu_{m+1} & [\mathcal{H}_0, p^m_\mu] = -m p^{m-1}_\mu, \\ [\mathcal{H}_0, q^{*\mu}_m] = (m+1) q^{*\mu}_{m+1} & [\mathcal{H}_0, p^m_{*\mu}] = -m p^{m-1}_{*\mu}, \\ [\mathcal{H}_0, \theta^\mu_1] = -\theta^\mu_0 & [\mathcal{H}_0, \chi^{-2}_\mu] = 0, \\ [\mathcal{H}_0, \theta^\mu_0] = 0 & [\mathcal{H}_0, \chi^{-1}_\mu] = \chi^{-2}_\mu, \\ [\mathcal{H}_0, \gamma^\mu_0] = \gamma^\mu_1 & [\mathcal{H}_0, \beta^0_\mu] = 0, \\ [\mathcal{H}_0, \gamma^\mu_1] = 0 & [\mathcal{H}_0, \beta^1_\mu] = -\beta^0_\mu. \end{array} \tag{4.52}$$

We verify that $[\mathcal{H}_0, Q_d + Q_a] = 0$, but

$$[\mathcal{H}_0, Q_m] = -2\eta_{\mu\nu} q^\mu_2 \gamma^\nu_0 - \eta_{\mu\nu} q^\mu_1 \gamma^\nu_1. \tag{4.53}$$

The first term equals $[\mathcal{H}_1, Q_d]$, where

$$\mathcal{H}_1 = -\eta_{\mu\nu} q^{*\mu}_0 \gamma^\nu_0, \tag{4.54}$$

and it can hence be cancelled by taking the Hamiltonian to be $\mathcal{H}_0 + \mathcal{H}_1$. It does not seem possible to cancel the second term in (4.53), though.

4.7 Reparametrizations

We denote the reparametrization generators by $L(t)$, or equivalently use the smeared generators

$$L_f = \int dt\ f(t) L(t). \tag{4.55}$$

They generate the algebra $\mathfrak{vect}(1)$:

$$\begin{aligned} [L(t), L(t')] &= (L(t) + L(t'))\dot{\delta}(t-t'), \\ [L_f, L_g] &= L_{[f,g]}, \end{aligned} \tag{4.56}$$

where $[f,g] = f\dot{g} - g\dot{f}$. The representations of $\mathfrak{vect}(1)$ are densities (primary fields) $\phi(t)$ of weight λ, transforming as

$$[L_f, \phi(t)] = -f(t)\dot{\phi}(t) - \lambda \dot{f}(t)\phi(t). \tag{4.57}$$

We write $\mathrm{wt}\,\phi(t) = \lambda$; in particular, $\mathrm{wt}\,L(t) = 2$. If $\mathrm{wt}\,\phi(t) = 0$, then $\dot{\phi}(t)$ is also primary and $\mathrm{wt}\,\dot{\phi}(t) = 1$. On the other hand, if the weight of $\phi(t)$ is some $\lambda \neq 0$, then $\dot{\phi}(t)$ is not primary, but there is an additional term proportional to $\phi(t)$ in the RHS of (4.57). The integral $\int dt\ \phi(t)$ can only be defined if $\mathrm{wt}\,\phi(t) = 1$; in that case, the integral transforms trivially.

To give a reparametrization invariant formulation of the free particle, we add a new independent variable, the einbein $e(t)$, with momentum $p_e(t)$, satisfying $[e(t), p_e(t')] = i\delta(t-t')$. We introduce the suggestive notation

$$\dot{\tau}(t) = e^{-1}(t), \quad \frac{df}{d\tau}(t) = e(t)\dot{f}(t), \quad \int d\tau\ f(t) = \int dt\ \dot{\tau}(t)f(t). \tag{4.58}$$

$\tau(t)$ can be thought of as proper time. $\mathrm{wt}\,\tau(t) = 0$, and hence $\mathrm{wt}\,\dot{\tau}(t) = 1$ and $\mathrm{wt}\,e(t) = -1$.

To obtain a reparametrization invariant formulation of the free particle, we simply replace $t \to \tau(t)$ and $df/dt \to df/d\tau$ everywhere in the formulas above. The dynamics constraint (4.2) becomes

$$\mathcal{E}^\mu(t) = \frac{d^2q^\mu}{d\tau^2}(t) \equiv e(t)\frac{d}{dt}(e(t)\dot{q}^\mu(t)) \tag{4.59}$$

and the redundancies (4.4)

$$\begin{aligned} \int d\tau\ \mathcal{E}^\mu(t) &= \int dt\ \dot{\tau}(t)\,\mathcal{E}^\mu(t) \equiv 0, \\ \int d\tau\ \tau\,\mathcal{E}^\mu(t) &= \int dt\ \dot{\tau}(t)\,\tau(t)\mathcal{E}^\mu(t) \equiv 0. \end{aligned} \tag{4.60}$$

The mode expansion (4.11) is replaced by

$$\begin{aligned} q^\mu(t) &= \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} q^\mu_m \tau^m, \\ p_\mu(t) &= \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} p^m_\mu \tau^{-m-1}, \end{aligned} \tag{4.61}$$

and the Taylor modes still satisfy the brackets (4.12). When formulated in terms of these Taylor modes, all formulas in subsection 4.2 remain unchanged.

The reparametrizations $L(t)$ generate a gauge symmetry, which we want to eliminate in cohomology. To this end, we introduce a fermionic ghost $c(t)$ with canonical momentum $b(t)$, satisfying the CAR $\{c(t), b(t')\} = \delta(t-t')$. The total list of antifields is thus given by

Field	Parity	λ	Momentum	λ	c	Constraint	λ
$q^\mu(t)$	B	0	$p_\mu(t)$	1	$2d$		
$e(t)$	B	-1	$p_e(t)$	2	24		
$q_*^\mu(t)$	F	0	$p_\mu^*(t)$	1	$-2d$	$\mathcal{E}^\mu(t)$	0
$c(t)$	F	2	$b(t)$	-1	-24	$L(t)$	2
θ_1^μ	B	$-$	χ_μ^1	$-$	0	$\int d\tau\ q_*^\mu$	0
θ_0^μ	B	$-$	χ_μ^0	$-$	0	$\int d\tau\ \tau\, q_*^\mu$	0
β_μ^0	F	$-$	γ_0^μ	$-$	0	p_μ^0	0
β_μ^1	F	$-$	γ_1^μ	$-$	0	p_μ^1	0

(4.62)

Note that $\operatorname{wt}\mathcal{E}^\mu(t) = 0$, and hence $\operatorname{wt} q_*^\mu(t) = 0$. This difference compared to subsection 4.2 arises because the Euler-Lagrange equation (4.59) is the second derivative w.r.t. τ rather than w.r.t. t.

The ghost contribution to the BRST operator reads

$$Q_c = \int dt\ L(t)b(t) + \frac{1}{2}\int dt\ L^{gh}(t)b(t) = L_b + \frac{1}{2}L_b^{gh}, \tag{4.63}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} L(t) &= -i\dot{q}^\mu(t)p_\mu(t) - i\dot{e}(t)p_e(t) + 2i\frac{d}{dt}(e(t)p_e(t)) - \dot{q}_*^\mu(t)p_\mu^*(t), \\ L^{gh}(t) &= \dot{b}(t)c(t), \end{aligned} \tag{4.64}$$

and L_b and L_b^{gh} denote the generators smeared with $b(t)$, in analogy with (4.55). Q_c commutes with $Q_q = Q_d + Q_a + Q_m$ because $[L(t), Q_q] = 0$ and $[Q_q, e(t)] = 0$, and $Q_c^2 = 0$ by construction. Hence the total BRST operator $Q' = Q_d + Q_a + Q_m + Q_c$ is also nilpotent, and its cohomology defines the physical phase space by $C(\mathcal{P}) = H_{cl}^0(Q')$.

We quantize as usual by introducing a vacuum state $\big|0\big\rangle$. As we discussed in subsection 4.3, there is some freedom in doing so, but the details are not very important. We may define modes as in (4.11) or as in (4.61), and demand that all negative modes annihilate the vacuum. What matters is that we divide the generators of the history phase space $\mathcal{HP}^* = \mathcal{HP}_+^* \oplus \mathcal{HP}_-^*$

into two subspaces of equal size, and that the involution maps $\mathcal{HP}^*_+$ and $\mathcal{HP}^*_-$ into each other. We can then define the vacuum $\big|0\big\rangle$ by $\mathcal{HP}^*_-\big|0\big\rangle = 0$.

There is one complication. When acting on the vacuum, the constant part of the total reparametrization generators $L^{TOT}(t) = L(t) + L^{gh}(t)$ gives infinity, $\int dt\ L^{TOT}(t)\big|0\big\rangle = \infty\big|0\big\rangle$. To remedy this, we must normal order, i.e. move all negative modes in (4.64) to the right and the positive modes to the left. As is well known, this leads to a central extension, and $\mathfrak{vect}(1)$ must be replaced by the Virasoro algebra with central charge c:

$$[L_f, L_g] = L_{[f,g]} + \frac{c}{24\pi i}\int dt\ \big(\dddot{f}(t)\dot{g}(t) - \dot{f}(t)g(t)\big). \tag{4.65}$$

This is a potential problem, because if the central charge of the total reparametrization operator $L^{TOT}_f = L_f + L^{gh}_f$ is $c_{TOT} \neq 0$, the total BRST operator $Q_{TOT} = Q_q + Q_c$ is no longer nilpotent after quantization. This does not have to be a disaster; it would just mean that after quantization reparametrizations become a global symmetry, which act on the Hilbert space rather than reducing it. This point is further emphasized in subsection 10.3.

However, anomalies are not a problem in this case. The contribution to the central charge from the various fields and antifields is listed in the sixth column in the table (4.62). Adding the c's together, we see that the total central charge is

$$c_{TOT} = 2d + 24 - 2d - 24 = 0. \tag{4.66}$$

The total Virasoro algebra is thus anomaly free, and $Q^2_{TOT} = 0$. There is no obstruction to the elimination of reparametrizations for the free particle.

5 Free scalar field

5.1 Conventional canonical quantization

The action

$$S = \frac{1}{2}\int d^4x\ (\eta^{\mu\nu}\partial_\mu\phi(x)\partial_\nu\phi(x) - \omega^2\phi(x)^2), \tag{5.1}$$

leads to the EL equation

$$\mathcal{E}(x) \equiv \eta^{\mu\nu}\partial_\mu\partial_\nu\phi(x) + \omega^2\phi(x) = 0. \tag{5.2}$$

From the corresponding expression in Fourier space,

$$\mathcal{E}(k) \equiv (k_0^2 - \mathbf{k}^2 - \omega^2)\phi(k) = 0, \tag{5.3}$$

we see that the solution is given by Fourier modes $\phi(k) = \phi(k_0, \mathbf{k})$ with $k_0 = \pm\omega_\mathbf{k}$, where

$$\omega_\mathbf{k} \equiv \sqrt{\mathbf{k}^2 + \omega^2}. \tag{5.4}$$

The canonical momenta are defined by $\pi(x) = \partial_0\phi(x)$, i.e.

$$\mathcal{M}(k) = \pi(k) - ik_0\phi(k) \approx 0. \tag{5.5}$$

They are subject to the equal-time CCR

$$\begin{aligned} [\phi(\mathbf{k}), \pi(\mathbf{k}')] &= i\delta(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{k}'), \\ [\phi(\mathbf{k}), \phi(\mathbf{k}')] &= [\pi(\mathbf{k}), \pi(\mathbf{k}')] = 0, \end{aligned} \tag{5.6}$$

where $\phi(\mathbf{k}) = \phi(k_0, \mathbf{k})$ for fixed k_0, etc. The time-independent Hamiltonian is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H} &= \frac{1}{2}\int d^3\mathbf{k}\ (\pi(\mathbf{k})\pi(-\mathbf{k}) + \omega_\mathbf{k}^2\phi(\mathbf{k})\phi(-\mathbf{k})) \\ &= \int d^3\mathbf{k}\ \omega_\mathbf{k} a^\dagger(\mathbf{k})a(-\mathbf{k}), \end{aligned} \tag{5.7}$$

where the annihilation and creation operators are

$$\begin{aligned} a(\mathbf{k}) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\omega_\mathbf{k}}}(\omega_\mathbf{k}\phi(\mathbf{k}) + i\pi(\mathbf{k})), \\ a^\dagger(\mathbf{k}) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\omega_\mathbf{k}}}(\omega_\mathbf{k}\phi(\mathbf{k}) - i\pi(\mathbf{k})). \end{aligned} \tag{5.8}$$

They satisfy the non-zero CCR,

$$[a(\mathbf{k}), a^\dagger(\mathbf{k}')] = \delta(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{k}'), \tag{5.9}$$

and carry energy $-\omega_\mathbf{k}$ and $\omega_\mathbf{k}$, respectively, i.e.

$$[\mathcal{H}, a^\dagger(\mathbf{k})] = \omega_\mathbf{k} a^\dagger(\mathbf{k}), \qquad [\mathcal{H}, a(\mathbf{k})] = -\omega_\mathbf{k} a(\mathbf{k}). \tag{5.10}$$

5.2 Non-covariant cohomological formulation

As for a single harmonic oscillator, there are several alternative cohomological descriptions. The description in subsection 3.5 is most suitable for generalization to field theory, and we proceed in analogy with that. The extended history phase space $\mathcal{HP}^*$ is spanned by $\phi(k)$, $\pi(k)$, $\phi^*(k)$ and $\pi^*(k)$, for all $k = (k_0, \mathbf{k}) \in \mathbb{R}^4$, and by $\theta(k)$, $\chi(k)$, $\beta(k)$, $\gamma(k)$, and $\alpha(k)$, for k on shell, i.e. $k^2 = \omega^2$. As usual, we take the nonzero brackets to be, for bosonic fields

$$[\phi(k), \pi(k')] = [\theta(k), \chi(k')] = i\delta^4(k + k'), \tag{5.11}$$

for fermionic fields

$$\{\phi^*(k), \pi^*(k')\} = \{\beta(k), \gamma(k')\} = \delta^4(k + k'), \tag{5.12}$$

and for the second-class bosonic field $\alpha(k)$

$$[\alpha(k), \alpha(k')] = -2k_0\delta^4(k + k'). \tag{5.13}$$

$\alpha(k)$ is needed to cancel the RHS of

$$[\mathcal{M}(k), \mathcal{M}(k')] = 2k_0\delta^4(k + k'). \tag{5.14}$$

Note that e.g.

$$[\theta(k_0, \mathbf{k}), \chi(k_0', \mathbf{k}')] = i\delta(k_0 + k_0')\delta^3(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{k}'), \tag{5.15}$$

and thus

$$[\theta(\omega_\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}), \chi(-\omega_{\mathbf{k}'}, \mathbf{k}')] = i\delta(\omega_\mathbf{k} - \omega_{\mathbf{k}'})\delta^3(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{k}') = i\delta(0)\delta^3(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{k}') \tag{5.16}$$

As in subsection 3.7, on-shell constraints will thus be accompanied by a harmless factor $\delta(0)$, which could be eliminated by putting the system in a finite box.

The field theory generalization of BRST charge (3.72) is $Q = Q_D + Q_A + Q_\mathcal{M}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} Q_D &= \int d^4k\ \mathcal{E}(k)\pi^*(-k) \\ &= \int d^4k\ (k^2 - \omega^2)\phi(k)\pi^*(-k), \\ Q_A &= \int d^4k\ \phi^*(k)\chi(-k)\delta(k^2 - \omega^2), \\ Q_\mathcal{M} &= \int d^4k\ (\mathcal{M}(k) + \alpha(k))\gamma(-k)\delta(k^2 - \omega^2) \\ &= \int d^4k\ (\pi(k) - ik_0\phi(k) + \alpha(k))\gamma(-k)\delta(k^2 - \omega^2); \end{aligned} \tag{5.17}$$

the dynamics constraint $\mathcal{E}(k)$ was defined in (5.3) and momentum constraint $\mathcal{M}(k)$ in (5.5). This BRST charge acts on $C(\mathcal{HP}^*)$ as $\delta F = [Q, F]$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta\phi(k) &= -i\gamma(k)\delta(k^2-\omega^2), \\
\delta\pi(k) &= i(k^2-\omega^2)\pi^*(k) - k_0\gamma(k)\delta(k^2-\omega^2), \\
\delta\phi^*(k) &= (k^2-\omega^2)\phi(k), \\
\delta\pi^*(k) &= \chi(k)\delta(k^2-\omega^2), \\
\delta\beta(k) &= (\mathcal{M}(k)+\alpha(k))\delta(k^2-\omega^2), \\
\delta\gamma(k) &= 0, \\
\delta\theta(k) &= -i\phi^*(k)\delta(k^2-\omega^2), \\
\delta\chi(k) &= 0, \\
\delta\alpha(k) &= -2k_0\gamma(k)\delta(k^2-\omega^2).
\end{aligned} \tag{5.18}$$

The cohomology is computed exactly as for the harmonic oscillator. For k off shell, $\phi(k)$ and $\pi^*(k)$ are both closed and exakt, whereas $\phi^*(k)$ and $\pi(k)$ are neither, and the cohomology vanishes. For k on shell, say $k = (\omega_{\mathbf{k}}, \mathbf{k})$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta\phi(\mathbf{k}) &= -i\gamma(\mathbf{k})\delta(0), \\
\delta\pi(\mathbf{k}) &= -\omega_{\mathbf{k}}\gamma(\mathbf{k})\delta(0), \\
\delta\phi^*(\mathbf{k}) &= 0, \\
\delta\pi^*(\mathbf{k}) &= \chi(\mathbf{k})\delta(0), \\
\delta\beta(\mathbf{k}) &= (\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{k})+\alpha(\mathbf{k}))\delta(0), \\
\delta\gamma(\mathbf{k}) &= 0, \\
\delta\theta(\mathbf{k}) &= -i\phi^*(\mathbf{k})\delta(0), \\
\delta\chi(\mathbf{k}) &= 0, \\
\delta\alpha(\mathbf{k}) &= 2\omega_{\mathbf{k}}\gamma(\mathbf{k})\delta(0).
\end{aligned} \tag{5.19}$$

The cohomology $H^\bullet_{cl}(Q)$ is generated by

$$a(\omega_{\mathbf{k}}, \mathbf{k}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\omega_{\mathbf{k}}}}(\pi(\mathbf{k}) + i\omega_{\mathbf{k}}\phi(\mathbf{k})) + x_{\mathbf{k}}\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{k}), \tag{5.20}$$

where $x_{\mathbf{k}}$ is an arbitrary constant. Analogously, the solution for the opposite on-shell value $k = (-\omega_{\mathbf{k}}, \mathbf{k})$ is

$$a(-\omega_{\mathbf{k}}, \mathbf{k}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\omega_{\mathbf{k}}}}(\pi(\mathbf{k}) - i\omega_{\mathbf{k}}\phi(\mathbf{k})) + y_{\mathbf{k}}\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{k}), \tag{5.21}$$

where $y_{\mathbf{k}}$ is another constant.

The Hamiltonian in $\mathcal{HP}^*$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{H} &= \int d^4k\ \Big(ik_0\phi(k)\pi(-k) + k_0\phi^*(k)\pi^*(-k) + \big(ik_0\theta(k)\chi(-k) \\ &\quad + k_0\beta(k)\gamma(-k) + \frac{1}{2}\alpha(k)\alpha(-k)\big)\delta(k^2-\omega^2)\Big),\end{aligned} \tag{5.22}$$

reduces to

$$\mathcal{H} = \int d^3\mathbf{k}\ \omega_\mathbf{k} a(\omega_\mathbf{k},\mathbf{k})a(-\omega_\mathbf{k},-\mathbf{k}) + \{Q,O\}, \tag{5.23}$$

O some operator, which is identical to (5.7) in cohomology. We note that Q and $\mathcal{H}$ are self-adjoint under involution, which sends $k = (k_0, \mathbf{k})$ to $-k = (-k_0, -\mathbf{k})$.

To quantize the theory, we introduce a vacuum $\big|0\big\rangle$ which is anniliated by all oscillators in $\mathcal{HP}^*$ with negative k_0. The dual vacuum $\big\langle 0\big|$ is annihilated by all modes with $k_0 > 0$.

5.3 Covariance and the observer's velocity

It is clear that the cohomological formulation in the previous subsection violates manifest covariance, and thus it violates the fundamental guiding principle behind MCCQ. The source of non-covariance is as usual the 3+1 decomposition $k = (k_0, \mathbf{k})$. In particular, the momentum constraint (5.5) and the related definition (5.13) depend explicitly on k_0 and are thus non-covariant.

We can restore apparent covariance by introducing a vector $u = (1, 0, 0, 0)$, which is naturally identified as *the observer's 4-velocity*. The time component of the momentum can then be written as $k_0 = k_\mu u^\mu$, i.e. as the projection of k onto u. However, this is of course a purely cosmetic improvement. We have only made explicit that the definition of energy depends on a hidden background structure, namely the observer's velocity. The key lesson from general relativity is that physics should not depend on background structures. Hence we need to eliminate the observer's velocity from the background by bringing it to the foreground, i.e. by giving it quantum dynamics.

The simplest way to do so is to assume that that the observer moves along a straight line, i.e. the the observer's trajectory has the form

$$q^\mu(t) = u^\mu t + s^\mu. \tag{5.24}$$

From the natural definition of the observer's momentum, $p^\mu = M_{obs}u^\mu$, we find that u^μ and s^μ are canonically conjugate, *viz.*

$$[s^\mu, u^\nu] = \frac{i}{M_{obs}}\eta^{\mu\nu}. \tag{5.25}$$

On the classical level, this modification is enough to ensure manifest covariance. We simply replace $k_0 \to k_\mu u^\mu$ everywhere in the previous subsection. Since $\delta u^\mu = 0$, the observer's velocity belongs to $H^\bullet_{cl}(Q)$ and is observable. However, $\delta s^\mu \neq 0$, and hence we can not observe the observer's position. This conclusion is of course absurd.

The problem arises from the momentum part of the BRST charge (5.17),

$$Q_{\mathcal{M}} = \int d^4k\ (\pi(k) - ik_\mu u^\mu \phi(k) + \alpha(k))\gamma(-k)\delta(k^2 - \omega^2). \tag{5.26}$$

The second term acts as follows on s^μ:

$$\delta s^\mu = \frac{-1}{M_{obs}} \int d^4k\ k^\mu \phi(k)\gamma(-k)\delta(k^2 - \omega^2). \tag{5.27}$$

The third term above is more subtle but also acts nontrivially on s^μ, since the brackets for $\alpha(k)$ involve k_0 and thus u^μ, cf. (5.13). The problem becomes even more acute on the quantum level. Here we need to represent the Heisenberg algebra on a Hilbert space with energy bounded from below. The positive-energy condition $k_0 > 0$ is thus replaced by

$$k_\mu u^\mu > 0, \tag{5.28}$$

which makes no sense because the observer's velocity is now a quantum operator.

The physical origin of these problems is the assumption that the observers mass M_{obs} is finite. If we instead assume the $M_{obs} = \infty$, we see from (5.25) that u^μ and s^μ commute, and hence $\delta_{\mathcal{M}} s^\mu = 0$. Since u^μ and s^μ commute with all other operators as well, they are central and can be represented by c-numbers. The condition (5.28) then makes sense, and we are back to the situation in the previous subsection.

This discussion leads to an important conclusion: underlying the usual formulation of canonical quantization is a hidden assumption about a macroscopic, and thus infinitely massive, observer. This is of course an excellent approximation to most experimental situations, where the measurement apparatus is much heavier than the phenomenon being observed. However, this approximation is fundamentally flawed, since all physical objects including the observer are fundamentally quantum. We argue in subsection 10.6 that this problem becomes serious when gravity is taken into account.

5.4 The need for QJT

We saw in the previous subsection that the explicit introduction of the observer's position and velocity is necessary but not sufficient for a manifestly covariant canonical formulation of quantum physics. The key problem resides in the condition (5.28). This is an operator equation for the indeterminate k. However, only operators like $\phi(k)$ can depend on operator equations, not c-numbers like k itself.

To circumvent this problem, and finally obtain a formulation of the free field which is manifestly covariant, we need to introduce Quantum Jet Theory (QJT). The idea behind QJT is to formulate physics in terms of jet data rather than field data. A p-jet $J^p\phi$ is normally defined as an equivalence class of functions; two functions are equivalent if their derivatives up to order p, evaluated at the point q, agree. Locally, a jet can be canonically identified with a truncated Taylor series around the point q, and this is sufficient for our purposes. We thus expand every field $\phi(x)$ in a multi-dimensional Taylor series around an operator-valued curve $q^\mu(t)$ in spacetime - *the observer's trajectory*:

$$\phi(x) = \sum_M \frac{1}{M!}\phi_M(t)(x - q(t))^M, \tag{5.29}$$

where M is a multi-index; in one dimension, M is just an integer and the sum runs over positive M.

It is now rather straightforward to translate the formalism above to jet space. E.g., the free-field equation (5.2) translates into the hierarchy

$$\mathcal{E}_M(t) = \sum_{\mu,\nu=0}^{3} \eta^{\mu\nu}\phi_{M+\mu+\nu}(t) + \omega^2\phi_M(t) \approx 0. \tag{5.30}$$

The crucial advantage of the passage to jet space is that it allows us to replace the vacuum definition (5.28) by a c-number equation; the quantization step does not involve an illegal operator equation. Introduce the frequency m by making a Fourier transformation w.r.t. t,

$$\phi_M(t) = \int dm\ \exp(imt)\phi_M(m). \tag{5.31}$$

We now posit that the vacuum $\big|0\big\rangle$ be annihilated by all oscillators of negative frequency, e.g.

$$\phi_M(-m)\big|0\big\rangle = \phi^*_M(-m)\big|0\big\rangle = q^\mu(-m)\big|0\big\rangle = ... = 0, \tag{5.32}$$

for all $-m < 0$. The important property is that this frequncy is a c-number, and we do not need any operators to distinguish between positive and negative frequency. The price is that we must explicitly introduce the observer's trajectory into the formalism. This amounts to a substantial modification of physics, e.g. because new diff and gauge anomalies arise.

In the next section, we implement this idea for the harmonic oscillator.

6 Harmonic oscillator in Quantum Jet Theory

6.1 Definition of constraints

We introduce an operator-valued curve $q(t)$, called *the observer's trajectory*, expand the field $\phi(x)$ in a Taylor series around it, and truncate at some fixed but arbitrary finite order p:

$$\phi(x) = \sum_{M=0}^{p} \frac{1}{M!}\phi_M(t)(x - q(t))^M. \tag{6.1}$$

We identify $\phi_M(t) = d^M\phi/dx^M|_{x=q(t)}$. The relevant history phase space is spanned by the observer's trajectory $q(t)$ and its momentum $p(t)$, the Taylor coefficient functions $\phi_M(t)$ for $0 \leqslant M \leqslant p$, as well as the corresponding momenta $\pi^M(t)$. The nonzero Poisson brackets are

$$[q(t), p(t')] = i\delta(t - t'), \qquad [\phi_M(t), \pi^N(t')] = i\delta^N_M\delta(t - t'). \tag{6.2}$$

This space thus consists of histories of p-jets and their momenta. It will be referred to as *the p-jet history phase space* and denoted by $J^p\mathcal{HP}$. Apart from the truncation order p, the definition of p-jets also depend on the expansion point $q(t)$ as well, although the notation does not make this explicit.

As a matter of nomenclature, QJT refers to Quantum Jet Theory in general, whereas QJT(p) specifically refers to the quantum theory of p-jets.

Since we are dealing with the harmonic oscillator, we assume that there is a one-dimensional metric δ_{MN} (simply the Kronecker delta), which can be used to raise and lower indices. We will use this freedom to put all Taylor indices $M, N, ...$ downstairs. E.g., the momentum $\pi_M(t) = \delta_{MN}\pi^N(t)$ satisfies

$$[\phi_M(t), \pi_N(t')] = i\delta_{MN}\delta(t - t'). \tag{6.3}$$

The dynamics constraint,

$$\mathcal{E}(x) = \phi''(x) + \omega^2\phi(x), \tag{6.4}$$

turns into the following hierarchy:

$$\mathcal{E}_M(t) \equiv \phi_{M+2}(t) + \omega^2\phi_M(t). \tag{6.5}$$

Since $\phi_M(t)$ is only defined for $M \leqslant p$, $\mathcal{E}_M(t)$ is defined for $M \leqslant p-2$.

We must also impose a new constraint, which expresses that (6.1) is independent of the trajectory parameter t. The RHS really defines a field $\phi(x,t)$; to ensure that this is independent of t, we impose the constraint $\partial_t\phi(x,t) = 0$, which leads to *the time constraint*

$$\mathcal{T}_M(t) = \dot\phi_M(t) - \dot q(t)\phi_{M+1}(t). \tag{6.6}$$

$\mathcal{T}_M(t)$ is defined for $M \leqslant p-1$. If we make the assumption that $\dot q(t) = 1$, the time constaint is simply replaced by

$$\mathcal{T}_M(t) = \dot\phi_M(t) - \phi_{M+1}(t). \tag{6.7}$$

This assumption amounts to a special choice of parametrization, namely $q(t) = t+s$, and the velocity $\dot q(t)$ is a c-number. In subsection 4.7 we discuss the modifications necessary when the original reparametrization invariance is not gauge fixed.

The dynamics and time constraints are not independent, since

$$\phi_{M+2}(t) \approx -\omega^2\phi_M(t) \approx \dot\phi_{M+1}(t) \approx \ddot\phi_M(t). \tag{6.8}$$

In the cohomological formulation below, this redundancy gives rise to extra terms in the BRST operator.

Finally we turn to the momentum constraint. We would like to impose

$$\mathcal{M}(x) = \pi(x) - \phi'(x), \tag{6.9}$$

but expressing a momentum $\pi(x)$ in terms of the jet momenta $\pi_M(t)$ is unnatural. Instead, we define the following momentum constraint, for $M \leqslant p$:

$$\mathcal{M}_M(t) \equiv \pi_M(t) - \dot\phi_M(t) = 0. \tag{6.10}$$

The momentum constraint is second class in view of

$$[\mathcal{M}_M(t), \mathcal{M}_N(t')] = -2\delta_{MN}\dot\delta(t-t'). \tag{6.11}$$

Moreover, it does not commute with the dynamics and time constraints; rather

$$\begin{aligned} [\mathcal{M}_M(t), \mathcal{E}_N(t')] &= -i(\delta_{M,N+2} + \omega^2\delta_{MN})\delta(t-t'), \\ [\mathcal{M}_M(t), \mathcal{T}_N(t')] &= i(\delta_{MN}\dot\delta(t-t') + \delta_{M,N+1}\delta(t-t')). \end{aligned} \tag{6.12}$$

It is convenient to perform a Fourier transform w.r.t. the trajectory parameter t. To avoid complications analogous to those in subsection 3.7, we should assume that the Fourier variable m is discrete, but $\pm\omega$ belongs to the domain of m; this amounts to putting the system in a large box. However, we ignore this technicality here, and define

$$\phi_M(t) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dm\ \mathrm{e}^{imt}\phi_M(m). \tag{6.13}$$

The Fourier transformed fields satisfy the nonzero brackets

$$[\phi_M(m), \pi_N(n)] = i\delta_{MN}\delta(m+n). \tag{6.14}$$

The constraints now become

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_M(m) &= \phi_{M+2}(m) + \omega^2\phi_M(m), \\ \mathcal{T}_M(m) &= im\phi_M(m) - \phi_{M+1}(m), \\ \mathcal{M}_M(m) &= \pi_M(m) - im\phi_M(m). \end{aligned} \tag{6.15}$$

Since the constraints for different values of m decouple, the Fourier description is much simpler, and we use it for the rest of this section. The following linear combination of momentum constraints,

$$\mathcal{M}_k(m) = \sum_{M=0}^{p} (-ik)^M \mathcal{M}_M(m), \tag{6.16}$$

satisfy

$$[\mathcal{M}_k(m), \mathcal{M}_{k'}(n)] = 2m\delta_p(k,k')\delta(m+n), \tag{6.17}$$

where

$$\delta_p(k,k') \equiv \frac{1-(-kk')^{p+1}}{1+kk'} = \delta_p(k',k). \tag{6.18}$$

Most of the constraints (6.15) and (6.16) are second class since $\mathcal{M}_k(m)$ has nonzero brackets with $\mathcal{E}_N(n)$ and $\mathcal{T}_N(n)$; the exceptions are

$$\mathcal{M}_\omega \equiv \mathcal{M}_\omega(\omega), \qquad \mathcal{M}_{-\omega} \equiv \mathcal{M}_{-\omega}(-\omega). \tag{6.19}$$

It is readily verified that

$$\begin{aligned} [\mathcal{M}_k(m), \mathcal{E}_N(n)] &= -i(-ik)^N(-k^2+\omega^2)\delta_{m+n}, \\ [\mathcal{M}_k(m), \mathcal{T}_N(n)] &= (-ik)^N(-m+k)\delta_{m+n}, \end{aligned} \tag{6.20}$$

which vanish when $m = k$ and $k = \pm\omega$. In particular, $[\mathcal{M}_{\pm\omega}, \mathcal{E}_N(n)] = [\mathcal{M}_{\pm\omega}, \mathcal{T}_N(n)] = 0$.

6.2 Solution of constraints

From the time constraint, we find $\phi_{M+1}(m) \approx im\phi_M(m)$, i.e.

$$\phi_M(m) \approx (im)^M \phi_0(m). \tag{6.21}$$

On the other hand, the dynamics constraint leads to

$$\phi_M(m) \approx \begin{cases} (-\omega^2)^{M/2}\phi_0(m), & \text{if } m \text{ even}, \\ (-\omega^2)^{(M-1)/2}\phi_1(m), & \text{if } m \text{ odd}. \end{cases} \tag{6.22}$$

Consistency then requires that

$$(im)^{M+2}\phi_0(m) + \omega^2 (im)^M \phi_0(m) \approx 0, \tag{6.23}$$

which holds if $m = \pm\omega$. The momentum constraint then gives the expression for the canonical momentum, $\pi_M(m) \approx im\phi_M(m) \approx (im)^{M+1}\phi_0(m)$. There are many equivalent expressions in $J^p\mathcal{HP}$ which correspond to the same elements in $\mathcal{P}$ after the constraints have been taken into account. The independent solutions can be taken to be

$$\begin{aligned} a_\omega &\approx (i\omega)^{-M}\phi_M(\omega) \approx (i\omega)^{-M-1}\pi_M(\omega) \\ &\approx \frac{1}{2}(i\omega)^{-M-1}(\pi_M(\omega) + i\omega\phi_M(\omega)), \\ a_{-\omega} &\approx (-i\omega)^{-M}\phi_M(-\omega) \approx (-i\omega)^{-M-1}\pi_M(-\omega) \\ &\approx \frac{1}{2}(-i\omega)^{-M-1}(\pi_M(-\omega) - i\omega\phi_M(-\omega)). \end{aligned} \tag{6.24}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_M(\omega) &\approx (i\omega)^M a_\omega, & \phi_M(-\omega) &\approx (-i\omega)^M a_{-\omega}, \\ \pi_M(\omega) &\approx (i\omega)^{M+1} a_\omega, & \pi_M(-\omega) &\approx (-i\omega)^{M+1} a_{-\omega}, \\ \phi_M(k) &\approx 0, & \pi_M(k) &\approx 0, \qquad \text{if } k \neq \pm\omega. \end{aligned} \tag{6.25}$$

The nonzero Dirac bracket between the independent solutions is as expected:

$$[a_\omega, a_{-\omega}] = -1, \tag{6.26}$$

which shows that they behave as standard harmonic oscillators. The evaluation of the brackets is simplest if we choose the last representatives for a_ω and $a_{-\omega}$ in (6.24), because the these commute with all constraints and hence there is no difference between Dirac and Poisson brackets. The natural Hamiltonian in $J^p\mathcal{HP}$ reads

$$\mathcal{H} = \sum_{M=0}^{p} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dm\ im\phi_M(m)\pi_M(-m). \tag{6.27}$$

It performs a rigid time translation of all histories, which in Fourier space amounts to a multiplication:

$$[\mathcal{H}, \phi_M(m)] = m\phi_M(m) \qquad [\mathcal{H}, \pi_M(m)] = m\pi_M(m). \tag{6.28}$$

In particular, it acts as follows on the constraint surface,

$$[\mathcal{H}, a_\omega] = \omega a_\omega, \qquad [\mathcal{H}, a_{-\omega}] = -\omega a_{-\omega}, \tag{6.29}$$

and thus acts as the correct harmonic oscillator Hamiltonian.

6.3 Cohomological formulation

To employ the BRST formalism, we need to make all constraints (6.15) commute. To this end, we first discard all momentum constraints except $\mathcal{M}_\omega$ and $\mathcal{M}_{-\omega}$, as defined in (6.16) and (6.19). These constraints commute with $\mathcal{E}_M(m)$ and $\mathcal{T}_M(m)$, but not with each other; instead

$$[\mathcal{M}_\omega, \mathcal{M}_{-\omega}] = \sigma_p(\omega), \tag{6.30}$$

where

$$\sigma_p(\omega) = -\sigma_p(-\omega) = \sigma_p(\omega, -\omega) = 2\delta_p(\omega, -\omega) = \frac{1-\omega^{2p+2}}{1-\omega^2}. \tag{6.31}$$

To rectify this, we introduce new variables α_ω and $\alpha_{-\omega}$, subject to the nonzero CCR

$$[\alpha_\omega, \alpha_{-\omega}] = -\sigma_p(\omega). \tag{6.32}$$

The modified momentum constraints

$$\mathcal{M}'_\omega = \mathcal{M}_\omega + \alpha_\omega, \qquad \mathcal{M}'_{-\omega} = \mathcal{M}_{-\omega} + \alpha_{-\omega}, \tag{6.33}$$

do commute with each other, and our full set of constraints is thus first class.

To eliminate the dynamics and time constraints, we introduce fermionic antijets $\phi^*_M(m)$ and $\bar\phi_M(m)$, respectively, with canonical momenta $\pi^*_M(m)$ and $\bar\pi_M(m)$, and brackets

$$\{\phi^*_M(m), \pi^*_N(n)\} = \delta_{MN}\delta_{m+n}, \quad \{\bar\phi_M(m), \bar\pi_N(n)\} = \delta_{MN}\delta_{m+n}. \tag{6.34}$$

We note that $\phi_M(m)$ only belongs to $J^p\mathcal{HP}$ if $M \leqslant p$. Hence $\mathcal{E}_M(m)$ is defined for $M \leqslant p-2$ and $\mathcal{T}_M(m)$ for $M \leqslant p-1$, and so are the corresponding antijets.

These constraints are not independent in view of (6.8). This leads to the secondary constraint,

$$\mathcal{R}_M(m) = \bar{\phi}_{M+2}(m) + \omega^2\bar{\phi}_M(m) - im\phi^*_M(m) + \phi^*_{M+1}(m). \tag{6.35}$$

To deal with this, we introduce the bosonic, second-order antijet $\bar{\phi}^*_M(m)$, with momentum $\bar{\pi}^*_M(m)$. Like $\mathcal{R}_M(m)$, it is defined for $M \leqslant p-3$. Finally, it turns out that yet another expression will be BRST closed, namely $\mathcal{B}_M(\omega)$ and $\mathcal{B}_M(-\omega)$, where

$$\mathcal{B}_M(m) = \phi^*_M(m) + \bar{\phi}_{M+1}(m) + im\bar{\phi}_M(m), \tag{6.36}$$

which is defined for $M \leqslant p-2$. To eliminate the corresponding unwanted cohomology, we introduce yet another bosonic antifields $\theta(\omega)$ and $\theta(-\omega)$ with momenta $\chi(-\omega)$ and $\chi(\omega)$.

To summarize, we have introduced antijets and canonical momenta according to the following table:

Field	Momentum	Parity	Order	Constraint
$\phi_M(m)$	$\pi_M(-m)$	B	p	$-$
$\phi^*_M(m)$	$\pi^*_M(-m)$	F	$p-2$	$\mathcal{E}_M(m)$
$\bar{\phi}_M(m)$	$\bar{\pi}_M(-m)$	F	$p-1$	$\mathcal{T}_M(m)$
$\bar{\phi}^*_M(m)$	$\bar{\pi}^*_M(-m)$	B	$p-3$	$\mathcal{R}_M(m)$
$\theta_M(\omega)$	$\chi_M(-\omega)$	B	$p-2$	$\mathcal{B}_M(\omega)$
$\theta_M(-\omega)$	$\chi_M(\omega)$	B	$p-2$	$\mathcal{B}_M(-\omega)$
β_ω	$\gamma_{-\omega}$	F	$-$	$\mathcal{M}_\omega + \alpha_\omega$
$\beta_{-\omega}$	γ_ω	F	$-$	$\mathcal{M}_{-\omega} + \alpha_{-\omega}$
α_ω	$\alpha_{-\omega}$	B	$-$	$-$

(6.37)

The third column indicates the Grassmann parity (bose/fermi), and the fourth the order where the constraints have to be truncated. Note that there are only two momentum constraints irrespective of p.

The BRST charge is $Q = Q_D + Q_T + Q_R + Q_B + Q_{\mathcal{M}}$, where

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_D &= \sum_{M=0}^{p-2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dm\ \mathcal{E}_M(m)\pi^*_M(-m), \\
Q_T &= \sum_{M=0}^{p-1} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dm\ \mathcal{T}_M(m)\bar{\pi}_M(-m), \\
Q_R &= \sum_{M=0}^{p-3} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dm\ i\mathcal{R}_M(m)\bar{\pi}^*_M(-m), \qquad (6.38) \\
Q_B &= \sum_{M=0}^{p-2} \big(\mathcal{B}_M(\omega)\chi_M(-\omega) + \mathcal{B}_M(-\omega)\chi_M(\omega)\big), \\
Q_{\mathcal{M}} &= (\mathcal{M}_\omega + \alpha_\omega)\gamma_{-\omega} + (\mathcal{M}_{-\omega} + \alpha_{-\omega})\gamma_\omega,
\end{aligned}$$

Q acts one the jets as $\delta F = [Q, F]$. For $m \neq \pm\omega$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta\phi_M(m) &= 0, \\
\delta\phi^*_M(m) &= \mathcal{E}_M(m) = \phi_{M+2}(m) + \omega^2\phi_M(m), \\
\delta\bar{\phi}_M(m) &= \mathcal{T}_M(m) = im\phi_M(m) - \phi_{M+1}(m), \\
\delta\bar{\phi}^*_M(m) &= \mathcal{R}_M(m) \qquad (6.39) \\
&= \bar{\phi}_{M+2}(m) + \omega^2\bar{\phi}_M(m) - im\phi^*_M(m) + \phi^*_{M+1}(m), \\
\delta\pi_M(m) &= i\big(\pi^*_{M-2}(m) + \omega^2\pi^*_M(m) - im\bar{\pi}_M(m) - \bar{\pi}_{M-1}(m)\big), \\
\delta\pi^*_M(m) &= im\bar{\pi}^*_M(m) + \bar{\pi}^*_{M-1}(m), \\
\delta\bar{\pi}_M(m) &= \bar{\pi}^*_{M-2}(m) + \omega^2\bar{\pi}^*_M(m), \\
\delta\bar{\pi}^*_M(m) &= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

The action on the momenta ($\pi_M(m)$, $\pi^*_M(m)$, etc.) is only written down for generic values of M. For M close to 0, some terms in the RHS are not defined; if so, these terms are discarded. For $m^2 = \omega^2$, say $m = \omega$, we have instead

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta\phi_M(\omega) &= -i(i\omega)^M\gamma_\omega, \\
\delta\phi^*_M(\omega) &= \phi_{M+2}(\omega) + \omega^2\phi_M(\omega), \\
\delta\bar\phi_M(\omega) &= im\phi_M(\omega) - \phi_{M+1}(\omega), \\
\delta\bar\phi^*_M(\omega) &= \bar\phi_{M+2}(\omega) + \omega^2\bar\phi_M(\omega) - im\phi^*_M(\omega) + \phi^*_{M+1}(\omega), \\
\delta\theta_M(\omega) &= \phi^*_M(\omega) + \bar\phi_{M+1}(\omega) + i\omega\bar\phi_M(\omega), \\
\delta\beta_\omega &= \mathcal{M}_\omega + \alpha_\omega, \\
\delta\alpha_\omega &= \sigma_p(\omega)\gamma_\omega, \\
\delta\pi_M(\omega) &= i\big(\pi^*_{M-2}(\omega) + \omega^2\pi^*_M(\omega) - im\bar\pi_M(\omega) - \bar\pi_{M-1}(\omega) - (i\omega)^{M+1}\gamma_\omega\big), \\
\delta\pi^*_M(\omega) &= m\bar\pi^*_M(\omega) + i\bar\pi^*_{M-1}(\omega) + \chi_M(\omega), \\
\delta\bar\pi_M(\omega) &= i\bar\pi^*_{M-2}(\omega) + i\omega^2\bar\pi^*_M(\omega) + \chi_{M-1}(\omega) + im\chi_M(\omega), \\
\delta\bar\pi^*_M(\omega) &= 0, \\
\delta\gamma_\omega &= 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{6.40}$$

To compute the cohomology, we first focus on the fields and ignore the momenta. Start with the time constraint. The kernel is generated by the functions $\phi_M(m)$, $\delta_T\phi_M(m) = 0$, and the image by the functions $\bar\phi_M(m)$, $\delta_T\bar\phi_M(m) = \mathcal{T}_M(m)$. Since there are $p+1$ functions $\phi_M(m)$ but only p functions $\bar\phi_M(m)$, one $\phi_M(m)$ must remain in $H^\bullet_{cl}(Q_T)$. Solving $\mathcal{T}_M(m)$, we see that it has many representatives in $J^p\mathcal{HP}$, namely

$$\phi_0(m) \approx (im)^{-M}\phi_M(m). \tag{6.41}$$

We next consider the dynamics constraint. The kernel is generated by the functions $\phi_M(m)$, $\delta_D\phi_M(m) = 0$, and the image by the functions $\phi^*_M(m)$, $\delta_D\phi^*_M(m) = \mathcal{E}_M(m)$. Since there are $p+1$ functions $\phi_M(m)$ but only $p-1$ functions $\phi^*_M(m)$, two $\phi_M(m)$ must remain in $H^\bullet_{cl}(Q_D)$. Solving $\mathcal{E}_M(m)$, their representatives in $J^p\mathcal{HP}$ are $\phi_0(m)$ and $\phi_1(m)$, and

$$\phi_M(m) \approx \begin{cases} (-\omega^2)^{M/2}\phi_0(m), & \text{if } M \text{ even}, \\ (-\omega^2)^{(M-1)/2}\phi_1(m), & \text{if } M \text{ odd}. \end{cases} \tag{6.42}$$

Now consider the combined cohomology $H^\bullet_{cl}(Q_T + Q_D)$. The expressions (6.41) and (6.42) are clearly only compatible if $m^2 = \omega^2$, i.e. $m = \pm\omega$, and the cohomology is generated by ϕ_w and $\phi_{-\omega}$, which have the representatives in $J^p\mathcal{HP}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi_\omega = \phi_0(\omega) &\approx (i\omega)^{-M}\phi_M(\omega), \\
\phi_{-\omega} = \phi_0(-\omega) &\approx (-i\omega)^{-M}\phi_M(-\omega).
\end{aligned} \tag{6.43}$$

All antijets vanish in cohomology. The only combinations which belong to the kernel are $\mathcal{R}_M(m)$ and $\mathcal{B}_M(\pm\omega)$, but they are also exact.

Now we turn to the corresponding momenta. The time constraint gives

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_T\pi_p(m) &= -i\bar\pi_{p-1}(m), \\ \delta_T\pi_M(m) &= m\bar\pi_M(m) - i\bar\pi_{M-1}(m), \qquad \text{if } 1 \leqslant M \leqslant p-1. \\ \delta_T\pi_0(m) &= m\bar\pi_0(m). \end{aligned} \tag{6.44}$$

There are $p+1$ functions $\pi_M(m)$ but only p functions $\delta_T\bar\pi_M(m)$. All of the latter are exact, but only p of the former can be non-closed, by linear independence. The linear combination which is closed is

$$\delta_T(\sum_{M=0}^{p}(-im)^M\pi_M(m)) = 0. \tag{6.45}$$

Analogously, the dynamics constraint gives

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_D\pi_p(m) &= -i\pi^*_{p-2}(m), \\ \delta_D\pi_{p-1}(m) &= -i\pi^*_{p-3}(m), \\ \delta_D\pi_M(m) &= -i(\pi^*_{M-2}(m) + \omega^2\pi^*_M(m)), \qquad \text{if } 2 \leqslant M \leqslant p-2, \\ \delta_D\pi_1(m) &= -i\omega^2\pi^*_1(m) \\ \delta_D\pi_0(m) &= -i\omega^2\pi^*_0(m). \end{aligned} \tag{6.46}$$

There are $p+1$ functions $\pi_M(m)$ but only $p-1$ functions $\delta_D\pi^*_M(m)$. All of the latter are exact, but only $p-1$ of the former can be non-closed, by linear independence. The linear combinations which are closed are

$$\delta_D(\sum_{M=0}^{p}(i\omega)^M\pi_M(m)) = \delta_D(\sum_{M=0}^{p}(-i\omega)^M\pi_M(m)) = 0. \tag{6.47}$$

Combining (6.45) and (6.47), we see that the only combinations which belong to the kernal of $Q_T + Q_D$ are

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_\omega &= \sum_{M=0}^{p}(-i\omega)^M\pi_M(\omega), \\ \pi_{-\omega} &= \sum_{M=0}^{p}(i\omega)^M\pi_M(-\omega). \end{aligned} \tag{6.48}$$

These linear combinations satisfy the following brackets with the elements in (6.43):

$$\begin{aligned} [\phi_\omega, \pi_{-\omega}] = [\phi_{-\omega}, \pi_\omega] &= i, \\ [\phi_\omega, \phi_{-\omega}] = [\phi_\omega, \phi_{-\omega}] &= 0. \end{aligned} \tag{6.49}$$

It is straightforward to verify that these brackets are independent of which representatives for ϕ_ω and $\phi_{-\omega}$ we choose from (6.43), and hence they induce well-defined relations in cohomology.

The antijet momenta all vanish in cohomology, and hence $H^\bullet_{cl}(Q_D + Q_T + Q_R + Q_B) = C(\phi_\omega, \phi_{-\omega}, \pi_\omega, \pi_{-\omega})$ with the Poisson bracket (6.49). Remains the momentum constraints, defined in (6.16) and (6.19). It is clear that they can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_\omega &= \sum_{M=0}^{p} (-i\omega)^M (\pi_M(t) - i\omega\phi_M(t)) \\ &\approx \pi_\omega - i\omega \sum_{M=0}^{p} (-i\omega)^M (i\omega)^M \phi_\omega \\ &= \pi_\omega - i\omega\delta_p(\omega, -\omega)\phi_\omega, \end{aligned} \tag{6.50}$$

and similar for $\mathcal{M}_{-\omega}$. The relations (6.30) follow immediately from (6.50) The remaining part of the BRST operator reads

$$Q_{\mathcal{M}} = (\mathcal{M}_\omega + \alpha_\omega)\gamma_{-\omega} + (\mathcal{M}_{-\omega} + \alpha_{-\omega})\gamma_\omega. \tag{6.51}$$

It acts as

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{\mathcal{M}}\phi_\omega = -i\gamma_\omega, &\qquad \delta_{\mathcal{M}}\pi_\omega = \omega\delta_p(\omega, -\omega)\gamma_\omega, \\ \delta_{\mathcal{M}}\beta_\omega = \mathcal{M}_\omega + \alpha_\omega, &\qquad \delta_{\mathcal{M}}\gamma_\omega = 0, \\ \delta_{\mathcal{M}}\alpha_\omega = \sigma_p(\omega)\gamma_\omega = \omega\delta_p(\omega, -\omega)\gamma_\omega, & \end{aligned} \tag{6.52}$$

and analogously on the modes with index $-\omega$. The kernel is generated by

$$\begin{aligned} a_\omega &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\omega\delta_p(\omega)}}(\pi_\omega + i\omega\delta_p(\omega, -\omega)\phi_\omega) + x(\mathcal{M}_\omega + \alpha_\omega), \\ a_{-\omega} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\omega\delta_p(\omega)}}(\pi_{-\omega} - i\omega\delta_p(\omega, -\omega)\phi_{-\omega}) + y(\mathcal{M}_{-\omega} + \alpha_{-\omega}), \end{aligned} \tag{6.53}$$

where x and y are arbitrary constants, multiplying terms belonging to $\mathrm{im}\, Q_{\mathcal{M}}$. The operators a_ω and $a_{-\omega}$ satisfy the brackets $[a_\omega, a_{-\omega}] = -1$ and are thus well-defined in cohomology. Hence the BRST operator (6.38) selects the correct phase space $\mathcal{P} = C(a_\omega, a_{-w}) = H^0_{cl}(Q)$.

6.4 Antijet constraints

One may wonder why there is no antifield constraint in the jet formulation. The reason is that we have chosen to truncate the jet $\phi_M(m)$ at order p. This forces us to truncate the time constraint $\mathcal{T}_M(m)$ at order $p-1$ and the dynamics constraint $\mathcal{E}_M(m)$ at order $p-2$, and hence the corresponding antijets are truncated at the same orders. That there are fewer constraints than fields is clearly necessary in order to have solutions, and non-vanishing cohomology. However, if we want we can add extra antijets, so that $\phi^*_M(m)$ and $\bar\phi_M(m)$ are defined for all m, $0 \leqslant m \leqslant p$. Since the dynamics and time constraints are not a priori defined when they involve a jet $\phi_M(m)$ with $M > p$, we must choose new constraints which are compatible with the solutions. The introduction of new antijets then leads to linear relations between the constraints, which require further antijets to be cancelled. At the end, the cohomology stays the same.

Let us see in detail how this happens. The constraints $\mathcal{E}_M(m)$ for $M \leqslant p-2$ and $\mathcal{T}_M(m)$ for $M \leqslant p-1$ were defined in (6.15). Now define

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{T}_p(m) &= im(\phi_p(m) - (im)^p\phi_0(m)), \\
\mathcal{E}_p(m) &= \omega^2(\phi_p(m) - (i\omega)^p\phi_0(m)), \\
\mathcal{E}_{p-1}(m) &= \omega^2(\phi_{p-1}(m) - (i\omega)^{p-2}\phi_1(m)).
\end{aligned} \tag{6.54}$$

For simplicity we assume that p is even, so that the relations $\phi_p(m) \approx (i\omega)^p\phi_0(m)$ and $\phi_{p-1}(m) \approx (i\omega)^{p-2}\phi_1(m)$ should be implemented in cohomology. We introduce new antijets $\bar\phi_p(m)$, $\phi^*_p(m)$ and $\phi^*_{p-1}(m)$, with momenta $\bar\pi_p(m)$, $\pi^*_p(m)$ and $\pi^*_{p-1}(m)$, to eliminate the new constraints.

The constraints are no longer independent; rather, they are subject to the relations

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{M=0}^{p} (im)^{-M}\mathcal{T}_M(m) &= 0, \\
\sum_{M=0}^{p} (i\omega)^{-M}\mathcal{E}_M(m) &= \sum_{M=0}^{p} (-i\omega)^{-M}\mathcal{E}_M(m) = 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{6.55}$$

Hence there are new expressions which belong to the kernel, namely

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta(\sum_{M=0}^{p} (im)^{-M}\bar\phi_M(m)) &= 0, \\
\delta(\sum_{M=0}^{p} (i\omega)^{-M}\phi^*_M(m)) &= \delta(\sum_{M=0}^{p} (-i\omega)^{-M}\phi^*_M(m)) = 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{6.56}$$

To eliminate these expressions in cohomology, we introduce new antijets $\bar\theta(m)$, $\theta^*_+(m)$ and $\theta^*_-(m)$, with momenta $\bar\chi(m)$, $\chi^*_+(m)$ and $\chi^*_-(m)$, respectively, and add the following term to the BRST operator:

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta Q \;&=\; \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dm\, \Big(\bar\chi(-m) \sum_{M=0}^{p} (im)^{-M} \bar\phi_M(m) \qquad (6.57)\\ &\quad + \chi^*_+(-m) \sum_{M=0}^{p} (i\omega)^{-M} \phi^*_M(m) + \chi^*_-(-m) \sum_{M=0}^{p} (-i\omega)^{-M} \phi^*_M(m)\Big).\end{aligned}$$

The new antijets cancel in quadruplets, and we return to the situation in the previous subsection.

6.5 Hamiltonian, involution, quantization

The natural Hamiltonian in $J^p\mathcal{HP}^*$ reads

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{H} \;&=\; \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dm\, \Big(\sum_{M=0}^{p} im\phi_M(m)\pi_M(-m) + \sum_{M=0}^{p-2} m\phi^*_M(m)\pi^*_M(-m) \\ &\quad + \sum_{M=0}^{p-1} m\bar\phi_M(m)\bar\pi_M(-m) + \sum_{M=0}^{p-3} im\bar\phi^*_M(m)\bar\pi^*_M(-m)\Big). \qquad (6.58)\end{aligned}$$

It picks out the Fourier variable,

$$\begin{aligned} &[\mathcal{H}, \phi_M(m)] = m\phi_M(m), \qquad [\mathcal{H}, \pi_M(m)] = m\pi_M(m), \\ &[\mathcal{H}, \phi^*_M(m)] = m\phi^*_M(m), \qquad [\mathcal{H}, \pi^*_M(m)] = m\pi^*_M(m), \end{aligned} \qquad (6.59)$$

etc. Since the cohomology generators are linear combinations of terms with $m = \pm\omega$, the Hamiltonian (6.58) commutes with the BRST charge and acts in a well-defined manner on $H^\bullet_{cl}(Q)$:

$$[\mathcal{H}, a_\omega] = \omega a_\omega, \qquad [\mathcal{H}, a_{-\omega}] = -\omega a_{-\omega}. \qquad (6.60)$$

To quantize, we introduce a vacuum $\big|0\big\rangle$ which is annihilated by all negative frequency modes in $J^p\mathcal{HP}^*$, e.g.

$$\phi_M(-m)\big|0\big\rangle = \pi_M(-m)\big|0\big\rangle = \phi^*_M(-m)\big|0\big\rangle = \pi^*_M(-m)\big|0\big\rangle = 0, \qquad (6.61)$$

for all $-m < 0$. We also have to divide the set of zero modes into creation and annihilation operators, but this choice is not important since only modes with $m = \pm\omega$ will survive in cohomology. The physical Hilbert space is identified with the quantum state cohomology $H^0_{st}(Q)$, which is spanned by the vectors $\big|n\big\rangle = (1/\sqrt{n!})a^n_\omega\big|0\big\rangle$; clearly, the Hamiltonian acts in the well-defined manner $\mathcal{H}\big|n\big\rangle = n\omega\big|n\big\rangle$, as appropriate for the harmonic oscillator.

We define involution in $J^p\mathcal{H}\mathcal{P}^*$ by $m \to -m$, i.e.

$$\phi_M(m) \to \phi_M(-m), \qquad \pi_M(m) \to \pi_M(-m), \tag{6.62}$$

etc. Involution commutes with the BRST charge and sends $\mathcal{H} \to -\mathcal{H}$; hence it acts in the correct way on the physical phase space, $a_\omega \to a_{-\omega}$ and $a_{-\omega} \to a_\omega$. If we denote the dual vacuum by $\big\langle 0\big|$, we obtain the correct inner product $\big\langle m\big|n\big\rangle = \delta_{mn}$.

We thus conclude that the quantum cohomology of the BRST operator (6.38) is a resolution of the correct Hilbert space of the harmonic oscillator: $H^0_{st}(Q) = \mathfrak{H}$ and $H^n_{st}(Q) = 0$ for all $n \neq 0$. This result is independent of the truncation order p.

6.6 Keeping the observer's trajectory

We now want to modify the analysis where we do not make the assumption $\dot{q}(t) = 1$, but keep $q(t)$ as a dynamical variable, subject to the Euler-Lagrange equation $\ddot{q}(t) = 0$. The total BRST charge is $Q = Q_\phi + Q_q$, where Q_ϕ is the field contribution and Q_q is the observer contribution. Here $Q_\phi = Q_D + Q_T + Q_R + Q_B + Q_{\mathcal{M}}$ is given by (6.38), which written in t-space reads

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_D &= \sum_{M=0}^{p-2} \int dt\ \mathcal{E}_M(t)\pi^*_M(t), \\
Q_T &= \sum_{M=0}^{p-1} \int dt\ \mathcal{T}_M(t)\bar{\pi}_M(t), \\
Q_R &= \sum_{M=0}^{p-3} \int dt\ i\mathcal{R}_M(t)\bar{\pi}^*_M(t), \\
Q_B &= \sum_{M=0}^{p-2} \big(\mathcal{B}_M(\omega)\chi_M(-\omega) + \mathcal{B}_M(-\omega)\chi_M(\omega)\big), \\
Q_{\mathcal{M}} &= (\mathcal{M}_\omega + \alpha_\omega)\gamma_{-\omega} + (\mathcal{M}_{-\omega} + \alpha_{-\omega})\gamma_\omega,
\end{aligned} \tag{6.63}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}_M(t) &= \phi_{M+2}(t)+\omega^2\phi_M(t),\\ \mathcal{T}_M(t) &= \dot\phi_M(t)-\dot q(t)\phi_{M+1}(t),\\ \mathcal{R}_M(t) &= \bar\phi_{M+2}(t)+\omega^2\bar\phi_M(t)-\dot\phi^*_M(t)+\dot q(t)\phi^*_{M+1}(t),\end{aligned}\tag{6.64}$$

and $\mathcal{M}_{\pm\omega}$ and $\mathcal{B}_M(\pm\omega)$ are unchanged. $Q_q = Q_d + Q_a + Q_m$ was written down in (4.10).

The Fourier transform (6.13) no longer makes sense, because it is $q(t)$ rather than t which is the physical time variable. Instead, we make the ansatz

$$\phi_M(t)=\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dm\ \mathrm{e}^{imq(t)}\phi_M(m).\tag{6.65}$$

If follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}_M(t) &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dm\ \mathrm{e}^{imq(t)}\mathcal{E}_M(m),\\ \mathcal{T}_M(t) &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dm\ \dot q(t)\mathrm{e}^{imq(t)}\mathcal{T}_M(m),\\ \mathcal{R}_M(t) &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dm\ \dot q(t)\mathrm{e}^{imq(t)}\mathcal{R}_M(m),\\ \mathcal{M}_M(t) &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dm\ \dot q(t)\mathrm{e}^{imq(t)}\mathcal{M}_M(m),\end{aligned}\tag{6.66}$$

where $\mathcal{E}_M(m)$, $\mathcal{T}_M(m)$ and $\mathcal{M}_M(m)$ where defined in (6.15) and $\mathcal{R}_M(m)$ was defined in (6.35). $q(t)$ and hence $\exp(imq(t))$ have zero weight under reparametrizations, and $\dot q(t)$ transforms as a density of weight 1; hence $\mathrm{wt}\,\mathcal{E}_M(t) = 0$ and $\mathrm{wt}\,\mathcal{T}_M(t) = \mathrm{wt}\,\mathcal{R}_M(t) = 1$. We introduce antijets with the same weights as the corresponding constraints, i.e. $\mathrm{wt}\,\phi^*_M(t) = 0$, $\mathrm{wt}\,\bar\phi_M(t) = 1$, and $\mathrm{wt}\,\bar\phi^*_M(t) = 1$, e.g.

$$\bar\phi_M(t) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dm\ \dot q(t)\mathrm{e}^{imq(t)}\bar\phi_M(m).\tag{6.67}$$

The weights of the canonical momenta are one minus the weight of the corresponding field, i.e. $\mathrm{wt}\,\pi_M(t) = 1$, $\mathrm{wt}\,\pi^*_M(t) = 1$, $\mathrm{wt}\,\bar\pi_M(t) = 0$, and $\mathrm{wt}\,\bar\pi^*_M(t) = 0$. In particular,

$$\pi_M(t) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dm\ \dot q(t)\mathrm{e}^{imq(t)}\pi_M(m).\tag{6.68}$$

Using that

$$\delta(q(t) - q(t')) = \dot{q}^{-1}(t)\delta(t - t') \tag{6.69}$$

and the properties of the Fourier transform, we show that the CCR $[\phi_M(m), \pi_N(n)] = i\delta_{MN}\delta(m + n)$ lead to the expected brackets $[\phi_M(t), \pi_N(t)] = i\delta_{MN}\delta(t - t')$.

When expressed in terms of the Fourier variables $\phi_M(m)$, $\phi^*_M(m)$, $\bar\phi_M(m)$ and $\bar\phi^*_M(m)$ and their momenta, the BRST operator Q_ϕ exactly reproduces the BRST charge (6.38) in subsection 6.3. The analysis in that subsection thus applies, and we obtain a phase space $\mathcal{P}_\phi$ with $C(\mathcal{P}_\phi) = H^0_{cl}(Q_\phi) = C(a_\omega, a_{-\omega})$, as in (6.53). However, we also have to take the observer's trajectory into account. According to the analysis in subsection 4.3, the space of functions over the observer phase space $\mathcal{P}_q$ is $C(\mathcal{P}_q) = H^0_{cl}(Q_q) = C(u, s)$, where the observer's velocity and position satisfy the CCR $[u, s] = i$. Hence the total phase space $\mathcal{P}_{TOT} = \mathcal{P}_\phi + \mathcal{P}_q$ has the function algebra

$$C(\mathcal{P}_{TOT}) = H^0_{cl}(Q_\phi + Q_q) = C(a_\omega, a_{-\omega}, u, s) = C(\mathcal{P}_\phi) \otimes C(\mathcal{P}_q). \tag{6.70}$$

6.7 Hamiltonian and the observer

In the previous subsection we computed the cohomology of the total BRST charge $Q = Q_{TOT} = Q_\phi + Q_q$, but we did not specify the Hamiltonian. A first guess would be to take the *total Hamiltonian* $\mathcal{H}_{TOT} = \mathcal{H}^0_\phi + \mathcal{H}^0_q$, where

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{H}^0_\phi &= \sum_{M=0}^{p} \int dt\ \dot\phi_M(t)\pi_M(t) - i\sum_{M=0}^{p-2} \int dt\ \dot\phi^*_M(t)\pi^*_M(t) \\
&\quad - i\sum_{M=0}^{p-1} \int dt\ \frac{d}{dt}\bar\phi_M(t)\bar\pi_M(t) + \sum_{M=0}^{p-3} \int dt\ \frac{d}{dt}\bar\phi^*_M(t)\bar\pi^*_M(t). \\
\mathcal{H}^0_q &= \int dt\ \dot q(t)p(t) - i\int dt\ \dot q_*(t)p^*(t).
\end{aligned} \tag{6.71}$$

$\mathcal{H}_{TOT}$ commutes with the total BRST operator Q_{TOT}: $[Q_{TOT}, \mathcal{H}_{TOT}] = 0$, and would therefore seem as a good candidate Hamiltonian. However, it is not want we want, because it commutes with the fields,

$$\begin{aligned}
[\mathcal{H}_{TOT}, \phi(x)] &= -i\sum_{M=0}^{p} \frac{1}{M!}\big(\dot\phi_M(t) - \dot q(t)\phi_{M+1}(t)\big)(x - q(t))^M \\
&\equiv -i\frac{d}{dt}\phi(x) \approx 0,
\end{aligned} \tag{6.72}$$

in view of the time constraint $\mathcal{T}_M(t)$. Instead, the natural generalization of the physical Hamiltonian would translate the field $\phi(x)$ in the time direction, i.e. in the direction of $\dot{q}(t)$. Natural candidates would be $\mathcal{H}^0_\phi$ are $-\mathcal{H}^0_q$, since

$$[\mathcal{H}^0_\phi, \phi(x)] = [-\mathcal{H}^0_q, \phi(x)] = -i\dot{q}(t)\phi'(x). \tag{6.73}$$

The physical interpretation of this relations is that the physical Hamiltonian translates the fields relative to the observer, or vice versa.

Unfortunately, the operators $\mathcal{H}^0_\phi$ are $-\mathcal{H}^0_q$ are not separately well defined in cohomology. Since

$$\begin{aligned} [\mathcal{H}^0_\phi, \mathcal{E}_M(t)] &= -i\dot{\mathcal{E}}_M(t), \\ [\mathcal{H}^0_\phi, \mathcal{T}_M(t)] &= -i\dot{\mathcal{T}}_M(t) - i\ddot{q}(t)\phi_{M+1}(t), \\ [\mathcal{H}^0_\phi, \mathcal{R}_M(t)] &= -i\dot{\mathcal{R}}_M(t) + i\ddot{q}(t)\phi^*_{M+1}(t), \end{aligned} \tag{6.74}$$

we see that

$$\begin{aligned} [\mathcal{H}^0_\phi, Q_T] &= -i\sum_{M=0}^{p-1}\int dt\ \ddot{q}(t)\phi_{M+1}(t)\bar{\pi}_M(t), \\ [\mathcal{H}^0_\phi, Q_R] &= i\sum_{M=0}^{p-3}\int dt\ \ddot{q}(t)\phi^*_{M+1}(t)\bar{\pi}^*_M(t). \end{aligned} \tag{6.75}$$

Hence $[\mathcal{H}^0_\phi, Q_\phi] = [\mathcal{H}^0_\phi, Q_T + Q_R] \neq 0$, and $\mathcal{H}^0_\phi$ is not BRST closed. To fix this problem, we add two more terms to the Hamiltonian:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}^1_\phi &= -i\sum_{M=0}^{p-1}\int dt\ q_*(t)\phi_{M+1}(t)\bar{\pi}_M(t), \\ \mathcal{H}^2_\phi &= i\sum_{M=0}^{p-3}\int dt\ q_*(t)\phi^*_{M+1}(t)\bar{\pi}_M(t). \end{aligned} \tag{6.76}$$

Since $[q_*(t), Q_d] = -\ddot{q}(t)$, we verify that

$$\begin{aligned} [\mathcal{H}^1_\phi, Q_q] &= -[\mathcal{H}^0_\phi, Q_T], \\ [\mathcal{H}^2_\phi, Q_q] &= -[\mathcal{H}^0_\phi, Q_R], \\ [\mathcal{H}^1_\phi, Q_R] &= -[\mathcal{H}^2_\phi, Q_D]. \end{aligned} \tag{6.77}$$

Hence $\mathcal{H}_\phi = \mathcal{H}^0_\phi + \mathcal{H}^1_\phi + \mathcal{H}^2_\phi$ is BRST closed:

$$[\mathcal{H}_\phi, Q_{TOT}] = [\mathcal{H}^0_\phi, Q_T + Q_R] + [\mathcal{H}^1_\phi, Q_R] + [\mathcal{H}^2_\phi, Q_D] = 0. \tag{6.78}$$

The physical Hamiltonian acts on the modes (6.65) as

$$[\mathcal{H}_\phi, \phi_M(m)] = m\phi_M(m), \tag{6.79}$$

i.e. the mode label m is nothing but the physical energy. In particular, the physical oscillators a_ω and $a_{-\omega}$ carry energy ω and $-\omega$, respectively:

$$[\mathcal{H}_\phi, a_\omega] = \omega a_\omega, \qquad [\mathcal{H}_\phi, a_{-\omega}] = -\omega a_{-\omega}. \tag{6.80}$$

6.8 Quantization

With the phase space and Hamiltonian at hand, we can now proceed to quantization. We first divide the extended history phase space $J^p\mathcal{HP}^* = J^p\mathcal{HP}^*_+ \oplus J^p\mathcal{HP}^*_-$ into positive and negative parts, where $J^p\mathcal{HP}^*_+$ is generated by modes (6.65) with $m > 0$ and $J^p\mathcal{HP}^*_-$ by modes with $m < 0$. As usual, there is some ambiguity with zero modes, but this is not important because it does not affect the physical modes with $m = \pm\omega$. Involution replaces m and $-m$ and thus exchanges $J^p\mathcal{HP}^*_+$ and $J^p\mathcal{HP}^*_-$. The vacuum $\big|0\big\rangle$ is mapped onto the dual vacuum $\big\langle 0\big|$, which is annihilated by positive modes.

We must also introduce some quantization prescription for the observer's trajectory and associated antijets. After this, the constraints are implemented by passing to the quantum BRST state cohomology, which becomes our Hilbert space.

If we choose a quantization for the observer's trajectory such that $s = q_0$ annihilates the vacuum, the total Hilbert space becomes

$$\mathfrak{H}_{TOT} = H^0_{st}(Q_\phi + Q_q) = C(a_\omega, u) = C(a_\omega) \otimes C(u) = \mathfrak{H}_\phi \otimes \mathfrak{H}_q. \tag{6.81}$$

We thus recover the correct Hilbert space for the harmonic oscillator, $\mathfrak{H}_\phi = C(a_\omega)$, as a factor in the total Hilbert space. There is another factor $C(u)$ which is the Hilbert space for the observer's trajectory, but it does not influence calculations in $C(a_\omega)$. QJT is hence equivalent to the standard quantization of the harmonic oscillator.

6.9 Reparametrization

The parameter t, which labels the points on the observer's trajectory, only becomes physical once the observer's equations of motion $\ddot{q}(t) = 0$ are taken into account. Instead, we can follow the route in subsection 4.7 and introduce an einbein $e(t) \approx q^{-1}(t)$. The observer's dynamics constraint (4.2) is replaced by (4.59), $d^2q/d\tau^2 \approx 0$. The reparametrization algebra $\mathfrak{vect}(1)$ acts on the fields $\phi_M(t)$, $\pi_M(t)$, etc. E.g.,

$$[L_f, \phi_M(t)] = -f(t)\dot{\phi}_M(t), \quad [L_f, \pi_M(t)] = -\frac{d}{dt}\big(f(t)\pi_M(t)\big). \tag{6.82}$$

The reparametrization weights λ of the p-jets and their antijets and momenta is given by the following table; in addition, $\mathfrak{vect}(1)$ also acts on the observer's trajectory as in (4.62).

Field	Parity	λ	Momentum	λ	n	c
$\phi_M(t)$	B	0	$\pi_M(t)$	1	$p+1$	$2(p+1)$
$\phi^*_M(t)$	F	0	$\pi^*_M(t)$	1	$p-1$	$-2(p-1)$
$\bar\phi_M(t)$	F	1	$\bar\pi_M(t)$	0	p	$-2p$
$\bar\phi^*_M(t)$	B	1	$\bar\pi^*_M(t)$	0	$p-2$	$2(p-2)$
β_k	F	–	γ_k	–	0	0
α_k	B	–	α_{-k}	–	0	0

(6.83)

In the last two columns, the number of components and the corresponding value of the central charge c are listed; note that the truncation order $p = n-1$. The normal-ordered reparametrization operator is $L(t) = L^q(t) + L^\phi(t)$, where $L^q(t)$ is the contribution (4.64) from the observer's trajectory and its antifields, and

$$\begin{aligned} L^\phi(t) \;\; &= \;\; \sum_{M=0}^{p} i :\!\dot\phi_M(t)\pi_M(t)\!: + \sum_{M=0}^{p-2} :\!\dot\phi^*_M(t)\pi^*_M(t)\!: \\ &\quad + \sum_{M=0}^{p-1} :\!\frac{d}{dt}\bar\phi_M(t)\bar\pi_M(t)\!: + \sum_{M=0}^{p-3} i :\!\frac{d}{dt}\bar\phi^*_M(t)\bar\pi^*_M(t)\!: . \end{aligned} \tag{6.84}$$

We noted in (4.62) that $L^q(t)$ generates a centerless Virasoro algebra when ghosts are taken into account. The central charge of $L^\phi(t)$ also vanishes, because

$$c_\phi = 2(p+1) - 2(p-1) - 2p + 2(p-2) = 0, \tag{6.85}$$

and hence the total reparametrization generators $L(t)$ satisfy a Virasoro algebra with $c = 0$. There is no obstruction to the elimination of reparametrizations.

7 Free scalar field in Quantum Jet Theory

7.1 Definition of constraints

We now turn to QJT(p) for the free field in d spacetime dimensions, which differs from the harmonic oscillator only in that the field $\phi(x)$ is defined for $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ rather than $x \in \mathbb{R}$. The observer's trajectory $q^\mu(t)$ is now an operator-valued curve in $\mathbb{R}^d$, and the Taylor series (6.1) is replaced by

$$\phi(x) = \sum_M^p \frac{1}{M!} \phi_M(t)(x - q(t))^M. \tag{7.1}$$

We employ standard multi-index notation. $M = (M_0, M_1, ..., M_{d-1})$ is a multi-index of length $|M| = \sum_{\mu=0}^{d-1} M_\mu$, $M! = M_0!M_1!...M_{d-1}!$, and $(x - q)^M = (x^0 - q^0)^{M_0}(x^1 - q^1)^{M_1}...(x^{d-1} - q^{d-1})^{M_{d-1}}$. Moreover, the notation $\sum_M^p$ is an abbreviation, meaning that the sum extends over all M such that $|M| \leqslant p$.

The history phase space $J^p\mathcal{HP}$ is now spanned by the observer's trajectory $q^\mu(t)$ and its momentum $p_\mu(t)$, and the Taylor coefficient functions $\phi_M(t)$ and $\pi^M(t)$ for $0 \leqslant |M| \leqslant p$. The nonzero Poisson brackets are

$$[q^\mu(t), p_\nu(t')] = i\delta^\mu_\nu \delta(t - t'), \qquad [\phi_M(t), \pi^N(t')] = i\delta^N_M \delta(t - t'). \tag{7.2}$$

We assume a flat, Minkowski metric $\eta_{\mu\nu}$ with inverse $\eta^{\mu\nu}$. By symmetrization, it induces a metric η_{MN} for the jets, which we use to lower all jet indices:

$$[q_\mu(t), p_\nu(t')] = i\eta_{\mu\nu}\delta(t - t'), \qquad [\phi_M(t), \pi_N(t')] = i\eta_{MN}\delta(t - t'). \tag{7.3}$$

The dynamics constraint,

$$\mathcal{E}(x) = \partial^\mu \partial_\mu \phi(x) + \omega^2 \phi(x), \tag{7.4}$$

turns into the following hierarchy:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_M(t) &= \sum_{\mu\nu} \eta^{\mu\nu} \phi_{M+\mu+\nu}(t) + \omega^2 \phi_M(t) \\ &\equiv \sum_\mu \eta_\mu \, \phi_{M+2\mu}(t) + \omega^2 \phi_M(t), \end{aligned} \tag{7.5}$$

where μ denotes a unit vector in the μ:th direction, and $\eta_\mu = +1$ for $\mu = 0$ and $\eta_\mu = -1$ for $\mu = 1, 2, ..., d-1$, i.e. $\eta_\mu = \eta_{\mu\mu}$ (no sum on μ). Since $\phi_M(t)$ is only defined for $|M| \leqslant p$, $\mathcal{E}_M(t)$ is defined for $|M| \leqslant p - 2$.

The time constraint reads

$$\mathcal{T}_M(t) = \dot\phi_M(t) - \sum_\mu \dot q^\mu(t)\phi_{M+\mu}(t). \tag{7.6}$$

$\mathcal{T}_M(t)$ is defined for $|M| \leqslant p-1$. For the harmonic oscillator, we could make the assumption $\dot q(t) = 1$. We could try to impose a similar condition in higher dimensions, i.e. $\dot q^\mu(t)\dot q_\mu(t) = 1$, but it is preferable to keep manifest reparametrization invariance as in subsection 4.7. Again, we have a redundancy between the dynamics and time constraints, corresponding to (6.8). This redundancy is most easily expressed if we assume that $\dot q^0(t) = 1$, $\dot q^i(t) = 0$ for all $i > 0$:

$$\phi_{M+2\hat0}(t) \approx \ddot\phi_M(t) \approx \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} \phi_{M+2\hat\imath}(t) + \omega^2\phi_M(t). \tag{7.7}$$

We choose the momentum constraint, for all $|M| \leqslant p$, to be

$$\mathcal{M}_M(t) \equiv \pi_M(t) - \frac{1}{M!}\dot\phi_M(t) = 0. \tag{7.8}$$

Compared to the analogous expression (6.10) for the harmonic oscillator, we have included a factor $1/M!$ in order to make $\mathcal{M}_M(t)$ Lorentz covariant, cf. subsection 7.6 below. $\mathcal{M}_M(t)$ neither commutes with itself nor with the other constraints; rather

$$\begin{aligned}
[\mathcal{M}_M(t), \mathcal{E}_N(t')] &= -i(\sum_\mu \eta_\mu \eta_{M,N+2\mu} + \omega^2\eta_{MN})\delta(t-t'), \\
[\mathcal{M}_M(t), \mathcal{T}_N(t')] &= i(\eta_{MN}\dot\delta(t-t') + \sum_\mu \dot q^\mu(t')\eta_{M,N+\mu}\delta(t-t')), \\
[\mathcal{M}_M(t), \mathcal{M}_N(t')] &= -\frac{2i}{M!}\eta_{MN}\dot\delta(t-t').
\end{aligned} \tag{7.9}$$

The linear combinations

$$\mathcal{M}_k(t) = \sum_M^p (-ik)^M \mathcal{M}_M(t), \tag{7.10}$$

commute with the dynamics constraint provided that $k^2 = \omega^2$. Finally, the expression

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{M}_k &= \int dt\ \mathrm{e}^{ik\cdot q(t)}\mathcal{M}_k(t) \\
&= \sum_M^p (-ik)^M \int dt\ \mathrm{e}^{ik\cdot q(t)}\mathcal{M}_M(t)
\end{aligned} \tag{7.11}$$

commutes with the time constraint as well. However, $\mathcal{M}_k$ for different values of k do not commute among each other; instead

$$[\mathcal{M}_k, \mathcal{M}_{k'}] = \sigma_p(k,k') = -\sigma_p(k',k), \tag{7.12}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_p(k,k') &= (k'_\mu - k_\mu)\delta_p(k,k') \int dt\ \dot{q}^\mu(t) \mathrm{e}^{i(k+k')\cdot q(t)}, & (7.13) \\ \delta_p(k,k') &= \delta_p(k',k) = \sum_M^p \frac{(-1)^M}{M!} k^M (k')^M. & (7.14) \end{aligned}$$

The integral $\mathcal{M}_k$ commutes with all dynamics and time constraints for all on-shell values of k, but not all such operators are linearly independent. This is clear because $\mathcal{M}_k$ is linear in the jet momenta $\pi_M(t)$ with $|M| \leqslant p$, and there are only $\binom{d+p}{d}$ such values of M. In fact, there are fewer. As we will see below, the dynamics constraint leaves $\phi_M(t)$ with $p-1 \leqslant |M| \leqslant p$ undetermined. Since there are

$$r_{p,d} = \begin{pmatrix} d+p \\ d \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} d+p-2 \\ d \end{pmatrix} \tag{7.15}$$

such values, we pick $r_{p,d}$ values k_i and define an index set

$$\mathcal{K} = \{k_1, k_2, ..., k_{r_{p,d}}\}. \tag{7.16}$$

The precise values of the k_i are immaterial, as long as $k_i^2 = \omega^2$ and the k_i are linearly independent. We will assume that all components $k_i^\mu \neq 0$, so that we can define $k_i^{-M} = \prod_\mu (k_i^\mu)^{-M_\mu}$ without problems. Moreover, we assume that if $k \in \mathcal{K}$, then $-k \in \mathcal{K}$, so that the Kronecker delta $\delta_{k+k'}$ is not identically zero. If we specialize to one dimension, $r_{p,1} = 2$, and the index set $\mathcal{K} = \{\omega, -\omega\}$ corresponds to the momentum constraints $\mathcal{M}_\omega$ and $\mathcal{M}_{-\omega}$ for the harmonic oscillator.

Finally, we must also introduce constraints for the observer's trajectory. We assume that the observer behaves as a free particle, i.e. that it is subject the dynamics constraints $\mathcal{E}^\mu(t) = \ddot{q}^\mu(t)$.

7.2 Cohomological formulation

To employ the BRST formalism, we need to make all constraints commute. To this end, we first discard all momentum constraints except $\mathcal{M}_k$, $k \in \mathcal{K}$. k is restricted to belong to the index set (7.16). These constraints commute with $\mathcal{E}_M(m)$ and $\mathcal{T}_M(m)$, but not with each other. To rectify this, we introduce new variables $\alpha(k)$ for all $k \in \mathcal{K}$, subject to the nonzero CCR

$$[\alpha_k, \alpha_{k'}] = -\sigma_p(k, k'). \tag{7.17}$$

The modified momentum constraints

$$\mathcal{M}'_k = \mathcal{M}_k + \alpha_k, \tag{7.18}$$

do commute with each other, and our full set of constraints is thus first class.

To eliminate the dynamics and time constraints, we introduce fermionic antijets as in (6.34). The reducibility leads to the extra constraint

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_M(t) &= \sum_\mu \eta_\mu \bar\phi_{M+2\mu}(t) + \omega^2 \bar\phi_M(t) \\ &\quad - \dot\phi^*_M(t) + \sum_\mu \dot q^\mu(t) \phi^*_{M+\mu}(t). \end{aligned} \tag{7.19}$$

To deal with this, we introduce the bosonic, second-order antijet $\bar\phi^*_M(t)$. Like $\mathcal{R}_M(t)$, it is defined for $|M| \leqslant p-3$. Finally, we introduce a pair of fermionic antifield β_k, γ_k for the momentum constraint $\mathcal{M}_k$.

To summarize, we have introduced antijets and canonical momenta according to the following table:

Field	Momentum	Parity	Order	Constraint
$\phi_M(t)$	$\pi_M(t)$	B	p	
$\phi^*_M(t)$	$\pi^*_M(t)$	F	$p-2$	$\mathcal{E}_M(t)$
$\bar\phi_M(t)$	$\bar\pi_M(t)$	F	$p-1$	$\mathcal{T}_M(t)$
$\bar\phi^*_M(t)$	$\bar\pi^*_M(t)$	B	$p-3$	$\mathcal{R}_M(t)$
β_k	γ_{-k}	F	$-$	$\mathcal{M}_k$
α_k	α_{-k}	B	$-$	$-$

(7.20)

The third column indicates the Grassmann parity (bose/fermi), and the fourth the order where the constraints have to be truncated. The number of momentum constraints is finite and equals $r_{p,d} = \dim \mathcal{K}$, whereas the other constraints are linearly infinite (there is one constraint for each $t \in \mathbb{R}$).

The BRST charge for the field $\phi(x)$ is $Q_\phi = Q_D + Q_T + Q_R + Q_{\mathcal{M}}$, where

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_D &= \sum_M^{p-2} \int dt\ \mathcal{E}_M(t)\pi^*_M(t), \\
Q_T &= \sum_M^{p-1} \int dt\ \mathcal{T}_M(t)\bar\pi_M(t), \\
Q_R &= \sum_M^{p-3} \int dt\ i\mathcal{R}_M(t)\bar\pi^*_M(t), \\
Q_{\mathcal{M}} &= \sum_{k\in\mathcal{K}} (\mathcal{M}_k + \alpha_k)\gamma_{-k},
\end{aligned} \tag{7.21}$$

Q_ϕ acts as $\delta F = [Q_\phi, F]$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta\phi_M(t) &= -i \sum_{k\in\mathcal{K}} (-ik)^M \mathrm{e}^{ik\cdot q(t)} \gamma_{-k}, \\
\delta\phi^*_M(t) &= \sum_\mu \eta_\mu\, \phi_{M+2\mu}(t) + \omega^2 \phi_M(t), \\
\delta\bar\phi_M(t) &= \dot\phi_M(t) - \sum_\mu \dot q^\mu(t) \phi_{M+\mu}(t), \\
\delta\bar\phi^*_M(t) &= \sum_\mu \eta_\mu\, \bar\phi_{M+2\mu}(t) + \omega^2 \bar\phi_M(t) \\
&\quad - \dot\phi^*_M(t) + \sum_\mu \dot q^\mu(t) \phi^*_{M+\mu}(t), \\
\delta\beta_k &= \mathcal{M}_k + \alpha_k, \\
\delta\pi_M(t) &= i\big(\sum_\mu \eta_\mu\, \pi^*_{M-2\mu}(t) + \omega^2 \pi^*_M(t) - \frac{d}{dt}\bar\pi_M(t) \\
&\quad - \sum_\mu \dot q^\mu(t) \bar\pi_{M-\mu}(t) + \sum_{k\in\mathcal{K}} \frac{(-ik)^M}{M!} \mathrm{e}^{ik\cdot q(t)} \gamma_{-k} \big), \\
\delta\pi^*_M(t) &= \frac{d}{dt}\bar\pi^*_M(t) + \sum_\mu \dot q^\mu(t) \bar\pi^*_{M-\mu}(t), \\
\delta\bar\pi_M(t) &= \sum_\mu \eta_\mu\, \bar\pi^*_{M-2\mu}(t) + \omega^2 \bar\pi^*_M(t), \\
\delta\bar\pi^*_M(t) &= \delta\gamma_k = 0, \\
\delta\alpha_k &= \sum_{k'\in\mathcal{K}} \sigma_p(k,k')\gamma_{-k'}.
\end{aligned} \tag{7.22}$$

As in (6.39), we only write down the RHS for generic values of M. If $|M|$ is sufficiently small, we replace $\pi^*_{M-2\mu}(t)$ and $\bar\pi^*_{M-2\mu}(t)$ by zero (if $M_\mu = 0, 1$), and $\bar\pi_{M-\mu}(t)$ and $\bar\pi^*_{M-\mu}(t)$ by zero (if $M_\mu = 0$). Conversely, if M is sufficiently large, we replace $\pi^*_M(t) \to 0$ (if $|M| = p-1, p$), $\bar\pi_M(t) \to 0$ (if $|M| = p$), and $\bar\pi^*_M(t) \to 0$ (if $p-2 \leqslant |M| \leqslant p$). Moreover, the BRST charge also receives contributions from the observer's trajectory. As explained in subsection 4.1, we must then introduce further antifields $q^\mu_*(t)$, θ^μ_0, θ^μ_1, β^0_μ, β^1_μ, α^0_μ, and their conjugate momenta. The observer BRST charge is $Q_q = Q_d + Q_a + Q_m$, as defined in (4.10). Hence the total BRST charge is $Q = Q_{TOT} = Q_\phi + Q_q$, and it acts on the extended history phase space $J^p\mathcal{HP}$ which contains all relevant antifields and antifield momenta.

7.3 Solution of constraints

To compute the cohomology, we make the simplifying assumption $q^\mu(t) = 0$ if $\mu \neq 0$. We can then write

$$\phi_M(t) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dm\ \mathrm{e}^{imq^0(t)}\phi_M(m). \tag{7.23}$$

This assumption clearly breaks manifest covariance, since it singles out the component $q^0(t)$ among the $q^\mu(t)$. Moreover, we will argue below in subsection 7.8 that this assumption is unphysical, although it implicitly underlies conventional quantization of fields. Nevertheless, equation (7.23) leads to great simplifications, and therefore we investigate it here.

Since $q^\mu(t)$ and hence $\exp(imq^0(t))$ has zero weight under reparametrizations, $\mathrm{wt}\,\phi_M(t) = 0$. As an example of an object which transforms as a density, we quote

$$\mathcal{T}_M(t) \quad = \quad \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dm\ \dot q^0(t)\mathrm{e}^{imq^0(t)}\mathcal{T}_M(m). \tag{7.24}$$

The weights λ of the different fields and momenta is listed in the table below:

Field	λ	Momentum	λ	Constraint	λ
$\phi_M(t)$	0	$\pi_M(t)$	1		
$\phi^*_M(t)$	0	$\pi^*_M(t)$	1	$\mathcal{E}_M(t)$	0
$\bar\phi_M(t)$	1	$\bar\pi_M(t)$	0	$\mathcal{T}_M(t)$	1
$\bar\phi^*_M(t)$	1	$\bar\pi^*_M(t)$	0	$\mathcal{R}_M(t)$	1
β_k	–	γ_{-k}	–	$\mathcal{M}_k$	–
α_k	–	α_{-k}	–		

(7.25)

The antifields associated to the momentum constraint transform trivially under reparametrizations.

The ϕ part of the BRST charge now becomes $Q_\phi = Q_D + Q_T + Q_R + Q_{\mathcal{M}}$, where

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_D &= \sum_M^{p-2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dm\ \mathcal{E}_M(m)\pi^*_M(m), \\
Q_T &= \sum_M^{p-1} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dm\ \mathcal{T}_M(m)\bar\pi_M(m), \\
Q_R &= \sum_M^{p-3} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dm\ i\mathcal{R}_M(m)\bar\pi^*_M(m), \\
\mathcal{E}_M(m) &= \sum_\mu \eta_\mu\, \phi_{M+2\mu}(m) + \omega^2\phi_M(m), \\
\mathcal{T}_M(m) &= im\phi_M(m) - \phi_{M+\hat0}(m), \\
\mathcal{R}_M(t) &= \sum_\mu \eta_\mu\, \bar\phi_{M+2\mu}(m) + \omega^2\bar\phi_M(m) - im\phi^*_M(m) + \phi^*_{M+\hat0}(m).
\end{aligned} \tag{7.26}$$

We first focus on the time constraint, which acts on the relevant fields as

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_T\phi_M(m) &= 0, & |M| &\leqslant p, \\
\delta_T\bar\phi_M(m) &= \mathcal{T}_M(m), & |M| &\leqslant p-1.
\end{aligned} \tag{7.27}$$

$\phi_M(m)$ belongs to the kernel and $\delta_T\bar\phi_M(m)$ to the image. Counting the number of components, we find that $\dim\ker Q_T = \binom{d+p}{d}$ and $\dim\operatorname{im} Q_T = \binom{d+p-1}{d}$, and hence

$$\dim H^0_{cl}(Q_T) = \binom{d+p}{d} - \binom{d+p-1}{d} = \binom{d+p-1}{d-1}. \tag{7.28}$$

The solution to the constraint $\mathcal{T}_M(m) \approx 0$ is

$$\phi_M(m) \approx (im)^{M_0}\phi_{(0,\mathbf{M})}(m) \equiv (im)^{M_0}\phi_{\mathbf{M}}(m), \tag{7.29}$$

where multi-indices have been decomposed into temporal and spatial components, i.e. $M = (M_0, \mathbf{M})$. The set of $\phi_{\mathbf{M}}(m) = \phi_{(0,\mathbf{M})}(m)$ thus constitutes a basis for $H^0_{cl}(Q_T)$.

Q_T acts on the conjugate momenta $\pi_M(m)$ as

$$\delta_T \pi_M(m) = \begin{cases} -i\bar{\pi}_{M-\hat{0}}(m) & \text{if } M_0 \geqslant 1,\ |M| = p, \\ m\bar{\pi}_M(m) - i\bar{\pi}_{M-\hat{0}}(m), & \text{if } M_0 \geqslant 1,\ |M| \leqslant p-1, \\ 0, & \text{if } M_0 = 0,\ |M| = p, \\ m\bar{\pi}_M(m), & \text{if } M_0 = 0,\ |M| \leqslant p-1. \end{cases} \tag{7.30}$$

The kernel is spanned by

$$\pi_{\mathbf{M}}(m) \equiv \sum_{M_0=0}^{p-|\mathbf{M}|} (-im)^{M_0} \pi_{(M_0,\mathbf{M})}(m), \tag{7.31}$$

$\delta_T \pi_M(m) = 0$. These vectors also span $H^0_{cl}(Q_T)$, because the image is empty. We verify that the bracket is well-defined in cohomology:

$$[\phi_{\mathbf{M}}(m), \pi_{\mathbf{N}}(n)] = i\eta_{\mathbf{MN}}\delta(m+n), \tag{7.32}$$

irrespective of the choice of representative for $\phi_{\mathbf{M}}(m)$ in (7.29). The corresponding antijet $\bar{\phi}_M(m) \notin \ker Q_T$, and its momentum $\bar{\pi}_M(m) \in \operatorname{im} Q_T$, and hence both vanish in cohomology.

We next turn to the dynamics constraint, which acts on the relevant fields as

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_D \phi_M(m) &= 0, & |M| &\leqslant p, \\ \delta_D \phi^*_M(m) &= \mathcal{E}_M(m), & |M| &\leqslant p-2. \end{aligned} \tag{7.33}$$

$\phi_M(m)$ belongs to the kernel and $\delta_D \phi^*_M(m)$ to the image. Counting the number of components, we find that $\dim \ker Q_D = \binom{d+p}{d}$ and $\dim \operatorname{im} Q_D = \binom{d+p-2}{d}$, and hence

$$\dim H^0_{cl}(Q_D) = \binom{d+p}{d} - \binom{d+p-2}{d} = r_{p,d}. \tag{7.34}$$

The solution to the constraint $\mathcal{E}_M(m) \approx 0$ is

$$\phi_M(m) \approx -\omega^{-2} \sum_\mu \eta_\mu \, \phi_{M+2\mu}(m). \tag{7.35}$$

Repeated use of this relation expresses $\phi_M(m)$ in terms of $\phi_N(m)$ with $|N| = p-1, p$, which we can choose as a basis for $H^0_{cl}(Q_D)$. Clearly, the number of such fields equals $\dim H^0_{cl}(Q_D)$ computed above.

Q_D acts on the conjugate momenta $\pi_M(m)$ as

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_D\pi_M(m) &= i(\sum_{\substack{\mu \\ M_\mu\geqslant 2}} \eta_\mu\,\pi^*_{M-2\mu}(m) + \omega^2\pi^*_M(m)), \quad \text{if } |M| \leqslant p-2, \\
&= i\sum_{\substack{\mu \\ M_\mu\geqslant 2}} \eta_\mu\,\pi^*_{M-2\mu}(m), \qquad \text{if } p-1 \leqslant |M| \leqslant p. \qquad (7.36)
\end{aligned}$$

Any vector of the form

$$\pi_k(m) = \sum_M^p (-ik)^M \pi_M(m), \qquad k^2 = \omega^2, \qquad (7.37)$$

belongs to the kernel, $\delta_D\pi_k(m) = 0$. However, not all $\pi_k(m)$ can be linearly independent, since there are infinitely many such vectors, and only finitely many functions $\phi_M(m)$. Since $\pi_M(m) \notin \operatorname{im} Q_D$, a linearly independent subset with $r_{p,d}$ elements of the vectors $\pi_k(m)$ in fact form a basis for the momentum part of $H^0_{cl}(Q_D)$ as well. The natural choice is to take $r_{p,d}$ vectors $k_i \in \mathcal{K}$, where the index set $\mathcal{K}$ is the same as in (7.16). A basis for $H^0_{cl}(Q_D)$ is thus given by $\phi_M(m)$, $p-1 \leqslant |M| \leqslant p$, and $\pi_{k_i}(m)$, $k_i \in \mathcal{K}$. We verify that the bracket is well-defined in cohomology:

$$\begin{aligned}
-\omega^2[\phi_M(m), \pi_k(n)] &= -i\omega^2(-ik)^M\delta(m+n) = \\
[\sum_\mu \eta_\mu\,\phi_{M+2\mu}(m), \pi_k(n)] &= -i\sum_\mu \eta_\mu\,k^{2\mu}(-ik)^M\delta(m+n),
\end{aligned} \qquad (7.38)$$

because $\sum_\mu \eta_\mu\,k^{2\mu} \equiv k^2 = \omega^2$ for all $k \in \mathcal{K}$.

Combining (7.29) and (7.35), we obtain

$$(\omega^2 - m^2)\phi_{\mathbf{M}}(m) \approx \sum_i \phi_{\mathbf{M}+2i}(m). \qquad (7.39)$$

A suitable representative for the $\phi_M(m)$ are

$$\phi_k = \sum_{\mathbf{M}}^p \frac{1}{\mathbf{M}!}(-i\mathbf{k})^{\mathbf{M}}\phi_{\mathbf{M}}(k_0), \qquad (7.40)$$

where $k = (k_0, \mathbf{k}) \in \mathcal{K}$, and $k_0^2 = \mathbf{k}^2 + \omega^2$. Combining (7.31) and (7.37), we find that

$$\pi_k = \sum_{\mathbf{M}}^p (-i\mathbf{k})^{\mathbf{M}} \sum_{M_0=0}^{p-|\mathbf{M}|} (-ik_0)^{M_0}\pi_{(M_0,\mathbf{M})}(k_0) = \sum_{\mathbf{M}}^p (-i\mathbf{k})^{\mathbf{M}}\pi_{\mathbf{M}}(k_0) \quad (7.41)$$

belongs to $\ker Q_T + Q_D$. They satisfy the bracket

$$[\phi_k, \pi_{k'}] = i\delta_p(k, k'), \tag{7.42}$$

where $\delta_p(k, k')$ was defined in (7.14).

The purpose of the BRST charge Q_R is to eliminate the unwanted cohomology $\mathcal{R}_M(m)$. Finally, we turn to the momentum part. Note that in view of (7.40) and (7.41), the momentum constraint can be rewritten as

$$\mathcal{M}_k = \pi_k - ik_0\phi_k, \tag{7.43}$$

which leads to the CCR

$$[\mathcal{M}_k, \mathcal{M}_{k'}] = k_0\delta_p(k, k') - k'_0\delta_p(k', k) = \sigma_p(k, k'). \tag{7.44}$$

This is the same as (7.12), since we made the assumption $\dot{q}^\mu(t) = \delta^\mu_0$ in (7.23). The analogous change is made in the CCR for $\alpha(k)$:

$$[\alpha_k, \alpha_{k'}] = -\sigma_p(k, k') = \sigma_p(k', k). \tag{7.45}$$

$Q_\mathcal{M}$ acts on the remaining fields as

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_\mathcal{M}\phi_k &= -i\gamma_k, & \delta_\mathcal{M}\pi_k &= -k_0\gamma_k, \\ \delta_\mathcal{M}\beta_k &= \pi_k - ik_0\phi_k + \alpha_k, & \delta_\mathcal{M}\gamma_k &= 0, \\ \delta_\mathcal{M}\alpha_k &= \sigma_p(k, -k). \end{aligned} \tag{7.46}$$

The kernel is generated by

$$a_k = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\sigma_p(k, -k)}}(\pi_k + ik_0\phi_k) + x_k\mathcal{M}_k, \tag{7.47}$$

where the x_k are arbitrary constants. These oscillators satisfy well-defined brackets in $H^0_{cl}(Q_\mathcal{M})$:

$$[a_k, a_{k'}] = \delta_{k+k'}, \tag{7.48}$$

which of course is the standard oscillators for the free field. Note that the a_k are not defined for all k, but only for $k \in \mathcal{K}$. Hence we have not obtained a resolution for the whole physical phase space $\mathcal{P}$ (or rather its ϕ part $\mathcal{P}_\phi$), but only for its p-jet approximation, which we denote by $J^p\mathcal{P}_\phi$. The corresponding function algebras are $C(\mathcal{P}_\phi) = C(\{a_k\}_{k^2=\omega^2})$ and $C(J^p\mathcal{P}_\phi) = C(\{a_k\}_{k\in\mathcal{K}})$, respectively. This is not surprising, since passing to p-jets amounts to a regularization. The classical cohomology gives a p-jet approximation to the correct phase space for the free field. In the limit $p \to \infty$, the index set $\mathcal{K}$ densely fills the surface $k^2 = \omega^2$, and the correct classical theory is recovered.

The history phase space $J^p\mathcal{HP}^*$, from which we started, also depends on the observer's trajectory, and hence the total phase space has the form $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}_{TOT} = \mathcal{P}_\phi \oplus \mathcal{P}_q$. The corresponding function algebra should be $C(\mathcal{P}) = C(\mathcal{P}_\phi) \otimes C(\mathcal{P}_q)$. However, there is a catch. Underlying the ansatz (7.23) is the assumption that the spatial components of the observer's trajectory vanish, $\dot{q}^i(t) = 0$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$. As we will discuss in subsection 7.8 below, this assumption becomes very dubious after quantization. However, we only used it to explicitly compute the cohomology. The history phase space $J^p\mathcal{HP}^*$ and the BRST operator $Q_{TOT} = Q_\phi + Q_q$ are defined without reference to this assumption.

7.4 Hamiltonian and quantization

As in for the harmonic oscillator, subsection 6.7, we define the Hamiltonians

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{H}^0_\phi &= \sum_M^p \int dt\ \dot{\phi}_M(t)\pi_M(t) - i\sum_M^{p-2} \int dt\ \dot{\phi}^*_M(t)\pi^*_M(t) \\
&\quad - i\sum_M^{p-1} \int dt\ \frac{d}{dt}\bar{\phi}_M(t)\bar{\pi}_M(t) + \sum_M^{p-3} \int dt\ \frac{d}{dt}\bar{\phi}^*_M(t)\bar{\pi}^*_M(t), \\
\mathcal{H}^1_\phi &= -i\sum_M^{p-1} \int dt\ \sum_\mu q^\mu_*(t)\phi_{M+\mu}(t)\bar{\pi}_M(t), \qquad (7.49) \\
\mathcal{H}^2_\phi &= i\sum_M^{p-3} \int dt\ \sum_\mu q^\mu_*(t)\phi^*_{M+\mu}(t)\bar{\pi}^*_M(t), \\
\mathcal{H}^0_q &= \int dt\ \dot{q}^\mu(t)p_\mu(t) - i\int dt\ \dot{q}^\mu_*(t)p^*_\mu(t).
\end{aligned}$$

There are two Hamiltonians which commute with the total BRST operator $Q_{TOT} = Q_\phi + Q_q$: the total Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}_{TOT} = \mathcal{H}^0_\phi + \mathcal{H}^0_q$ and the physical Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}_\phi = \mathcal{H}^0_\phi + \mathcal{H}^1_\phi + \mathcal{H}^2_\phi$. $\mathcal{H}_{TOT}$ translates both the jets and the observer, and hence the fields remain unchanged: $[\mathcal{H}_{TOT}, \phi(x)] = 0$. In contrast, $\mathcal{H}_\phi$ translates the fields relative to the observer,

$$[\mathcal{H}_\phi, \phi(x)] = -i\sum_\mu \dot{q}^\mu(t)\partial_\mu\phi(x). \qquad (7.50)$$

The proof is exactly as for the harmonic oscillator, except for the appearence of some indices. E.g.

$$[\mathcal{H}^0_\phi, \mathcal{T}_M(t)] \;=\; -i\dot{\mathcal{T}}_M(t) - i\sum_\mu \ddot{q}^\mu(t)\phi_{M+\mu}(t). \tag{7.51}$$

The second term leads to $[\mathcal{H}^0_\phi, Q_T] \neq 0$, but since $[q^\mu_*(t), Q_d] = -\ddot{q}^\mu(t)$, this contribution is cancelled by $[\mathcal{H}^1_\phi, Q_d]$. As for the harmonic oscillator,

$$\begin{aligned} [\mathcal{H}^1_\phi, Q_q] &= -[\mathcal{H}^0_\phi, Q_T], \\ [\mathcal{H}^2_\phi, Q_q] &= -[\mathcal{H}^0_\phi, Q_R], \\ [\mathcal{H}^1_\phi, Q_R] &= -[\mathcal{H}^2_\phi, Q_D]. \end{aligned} \tag{7.52}$$

and the physical Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}_\phi = H^0_\phi + H^1_\phi + H^2_\phi$ is a BRST closed observable.

We now quantize in $J^p\mathcal{H}\mathcal{P}^*$ by declaring that all modes with negative m annihilate the vacuum $\big|0\big\rangle$. We must also choose some representation for $q^\mu(t)$ and $p_\mu(t)$.

Let us now discuss some critical issues about the cohomological construction of the physical phase space in subsection 7.3. To compute the cohomology, we made the ansatz (7.23), which amounts to the assumption

$$\dot{q}^0(t) = 1, \qquad \dot{q}^i(t) = 0, \qquad \forall i = 1, 2, ..., d-1. \tag{7.53}$$

However, the observer's trajectory $q^\mu(t) \approx u^\mu t + s^\mu$ in $H^0_{cl}(Q_q)$. After quantization, u^μ and s^μ become quantum operators, subject to the CCR

$$[s^\mu, u^\nu] = \frac{i}{M_{obs}}\eta^{\mu\nu}, \tag{7.54}$$

where we have reinstated the observer's mass. Equation (7.53) means that we assume that the velocity u^μ has a well-defined value, which in view of (7.54) means that the position s^μ is completely undetermined. This is not a disaster for the free field, but an interacting we generally expect $q^\mu(t)$ to couple to the field $\phi(x)$. Only in the limit $M_{obs} \to \infty$ does the RHS of (7.54) vanish, and s^μ and u^μ become c-numbers.

Note that the dubious ansatz (7.23) is necessary to recover the p-jet approximation to the correct QFT Hilbert space $\mathfrak{H}$. This shows, or at least strongly suggests, that QFT implicitly contains the assumption $M_{obs} = \infty$.

7.5 Reparametrizations

We proceed in analogy with the treatment of the harmonic oscillator in subsection 6.9. The jets have reparametrization weights λ given by the following table:

Field	Parity	λ	Momentum	λ	Order	n	c
$\phi_M(t)$	B	0	$\pi_M(t)$	1	p	$\binom{d+p}{d}$	$2\binom{d+p}{d}$
$\phi^*_M(t)$	F	0	$\pi^*_M(t)$	1	$p-2$	$\binom{d+p-2}{d}$	$-2\binom{d+p-2}{d}$
$\bar\phi_M(t)$	F	1	$\bar\pi_M(t)$	0	$p-1$	$\binom{d+p-1}{d}$	$-2\binom{d+p-1}{d}$
$\bar\phi^*_M(t)$	B	1	$\bar\pi^*_M(t)$	0	$p-3$	$\binom{d+p-3}{d}$	$2\binom{d+p-3}{d}$
β_k	F	–	γ_k	–	–	0	0
α_k	B	–	α_{-k}	–	–	0	0

(7.55)

We have also listed the truncation order, the number of jet components n, and the corresponding value of the central charge c. After normal ordering, the reparametrizations generators satisfy a Virasoro algebra with central charge

$$\begin{aligned} c_\phi &= 2\binom{d+p}{d} - 2\binom{d+p-2}{d} - 2\binom{d+p-1}{d} + 2\binom{d+p-3}{d} \\ &= 2\binom{d+p-1}{d-1} - 2\binom{d+p-3}{d-1}. \end{aligned} \tag{7.56}$$

There is a significant difference between the harmonic oscillator, i.e. $d = 1$, and the free field in $d > 1$ dimensions. When $d = 1$, $c_\phi = 0$, and the reparametrization algebra is anomaly free. It is therefore possible to eliminate reparametrizations by adding ghosts as in subsection 4.7. In contrast, $c_\phi > 1$ when $d > 1$. This is not by itself devastating, because the Virasoro algebra has unitary lowest-weight representations for all $c > 1$, so unitarity is not necessarily lost. However, it means that it is not possible to eliminate reparametrizations.

What one could hope for is to eliminate reparametrizations for all jets with $|M| \leqslant p-3$. If we replace (6.84) by

$$\begin{aligned} L^\phi_0(t) &= \sum_M^{p-3} \Big(i :\dot\phi_M(t)\pi_M(t): + :\dot\phi^*_M(t)\pi^*_M(t): \\ &\quad + :\frac{d}{dt}\bar\phi_M(t)\bar\pi_M(t): + i :\frac{d}{dt}\bar\phi^*_M(t)\bar\pi^*_M(t): \Big), \end{aligned} \tag{7.57}$$

the counting now becomes

$$c_\phi = 2\binom{d+p-3}{d} - 2\binom{d+p-3}{d} - 2\binom{d+p-3}{d} - 2\binom{d+p-3}{d} = 0,$$

and the reparametrizations $L^0(t) = L^q(t) + L^\phi_0(t)$ can be cancelled by adding a term Q_c of the form (4.63) to the BRST charge. This would leave the piece

$$\begin{aligned} L^\phi_1(t) &= \sum_{|M|=p-2}^{p} i :\dot\phi_M(t)\pi_M(t): + \sum_{|M|=p-2} :\dot\phi^*_M(t)\pi^*_M(t): \\ &\quad + \sum_{|M|=p-2}^{p-1} :\frac{d}{dt}\bar\phi_M(t)\bar\pi_M(t):, \end{aligned} \tag{7.58}$$

which also generates a Virasoro algebra, with central charge given by (7.56). Because of the anomaly, the operators $L^\phi_1(t)$ do not generate a gauge symmetry after quantization. Instead, they act as global symmetry generators on the physical Hilbert space.

On closer scrutiny, however, the idea to eliminate only jets with $|M| \leqslant p-3$ does not seem to work. To see what goes wrong, consider the dynamics constraint alone. It is then enough to remove jets with $p-1 \leqslant |M| \leqslant p$ from the reparametrization generators, which now acts as

$$[L^0_f, \phi_M(t)] = \begin{cases} -f(t)\dot\phi_M(t), & |M| \leqslant p-2 \\ 0 & p-1 \leqslant |M| \leqslant p \end{cases} \tag{7.59}$$

Hence

$$[L^0_f, \mathcal{E}_M(t)] = \begin{cases} -f(t)\dot{\mathcal{E}}_M(t) + f(t)\sum_\mu \eta_\mu\, \dot\phi_{M+2\mu}(t), & \text{if } p-3 \leqslant |M| \leqslant p-2, \\ -f(t)\dot{\mathcal{E}}_M(t) & \text{if } |M| \leqslant p-4. \end{cases}$$

When calculating $[L^0_f, Q_D]$, terms with $|M| \leqslant p-4$ are not affected by the modification and vanish as before, and hence

$$[L^0_f, Q_D] = \sum_{|M|=p-3}^{p-2} \int dt\ f(t) \sum_\mu \eta_\mu\, \dot\phi_{M+2\mu}(t)\pi^*_M(t). \tag{7.60}$$

To eliminate this term, we would need to introduce a term

$$L^1_f = \sum_{|M|=p-3}^{p-2} \int dt\ f(t)\dot\phi^*_M(t)\pi^*_M(t) \tag{7.61}$$

to $L_f = L^0_f + L^1_f$. But this brings back antijets with $|M| \geqslant p-3$, which give rise to infinite anomalies in the $p \to \infty$ limit. Hence it appears that it is impossible to eliminate part of the reparametrizations.

A different, and even more disturbing, problem is that the central charge diverges in the field limit $p \to \infty$. The origin of this difficulty is that in a true p-jet approximation to the physical Hilbert space, all functions of t should be eliminated in cohomology, leaving only finitely many degrees of freedom. However, the time and dynamics constraints are unable to do this, because they are not defined for $|M| = p$ and $|M| = p-1, p$, respectively. There is thus a net surplus of bosonic functions of t ($c_\phi/2$ of them).

Similar anomalies which diverge when $p \to \infty$ also arise for diffeomorphisms and gauge symmetries, as we discuss in subsection 8.6 below. The proper treatment of these infinites remains obscure to me.

7.6 Poincaré algebra

The Poincaré algebra is generated by Lorentz transformations J_Λ and translations P_ε, subject to the brackets

$$[J_\Lambda, J_{\Lambda'}] = J_{[\Lambda,\Lambda']}, \qquad [J_\Lambda, P_\varepsilon] = P_{\Lambda\varepsilon}, \qquad [P_\varepsilon, P_{\varepsilon'}] = 0. \tag{7.62}$$

Here $\Lambda_{\mu\nu} = -\Lambda_{\nu\mu}$ and ε^μ are constants, and

$$\begin{aligned} [\Lambda, \Lambda']_{\mu\nu} &= \Lambda_\mu{}^\rho \Lambda'_{\rho\nu} - \Lambda_\nu{}^\rho \Lambda'_{\rho\mu}, \\ (\Lambda\varepsilon)_\mu &= \Lambda_\mu{}^\nu \varepsilon_\nu. \end{aligned} \tag{7.63}$$

We consider Lorentz rotations around the observer's trajectory. Hence the Poincaré algebra is realized by

$$\begin{aligned} J_\Lambda &= \Lambda_{\mu\nu}(x^\mu - q^\mu(t)) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_\nu} = \Lambda_{\mu\nu} k^\mu \frac{\partial}{\partial k_\nu}, \\ P_\varepsilon &= \varepsilon^\mu \frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu} = \varepsilon^\mu k_\mu. \end{aligned} \tag{7.64}$$

From the action on the field $\phi(x)$,

$$\begin{aligned} [J_\Lambda, \phi(x)] &= -\Lambda_{\mu\nu}(x^\mu - q^\mu(t)) \partial^\nu \phi(x), \\ [P_\varepsilon, \phi(x)] &= -\varepsilon^\mu \partial_\mu \phi(x), \end{aligned} \tag{7.65}$$

its follows that the Poincaré algebra must act on p-jets as

$$\begin{aligned} [J_\Lambda, \phi_M(t)] &= \sum_{\substack{\mu \\ M_\mu \leqslant p-1}} \sum_{\substack{\nu \\ M_\nu \geqslant 1}} \eta_\mu \Lambda_{\mu\nu} M_\nu \phi_{M+\mu-\nu}(t), \\ [P_\varepsilon, \phi_M(t)] &= -\sum_{\substack{\mu \\ M_\mu \leqslant p-1}} \varepsilon^\mu \phi_{M+\mu}(t). \end{aligned} \tag{7.66}$$

In particular, we note that the Lorentz transformations preserve the jet order in the sense that $[J_\Lambda, \phi_M(t)]$ is a linear combinations of terms $\phi_N(t)$ with $|N| = |M|$. Note that the sums in (7.66) only extend over μ and ν such that the terms in the RHS exist as p-jets. From the CCR $[\phi_M(t), \pi_N(t')] = const.$ it follows that the jet momentum must transform as

$$\begin{aligned} [J_\Lambda, \pi_M(t)] &= \sum_{\substack{\mu \\ M_\mu \leqslant p-1}} \sum_{\substack{\nu \\ M_\nu \geqslant 1}} \eta_\mu \Lambda_{\mu\nu} (M_\mu + 1) \pi_{M+\mu-\nu}(t), \\ [P_\varepsilon, \pi_M(t)] &= \sum_{\substack{\mu \\ M_\mu \geqslant 1}} \varepsilon_\mu \pi_{M-\mu}(t). \end{aligned} \tag{7.67}$$

The behaviour under Lorentz transformations is compatible with the identification $\pi_M(t) \approx (1/M!)\dot{\phi}_M(t)$, which motivates the factor $1/M!$. However, the action of P_ε is not compatible with this identification; demanding the the momentum constraint is preserved by translations instead leads to the transformation law

$$[P_\varepsilon, \pi_M(t)] = - \sum_{\substack{\mu \\ M_\mu \leqslant p-1}} \varepsilon_\mu (M_\mu + 1) \pi_{M+\mu}(t), \tag{7.68}$$

which is clearly different from (7.67).

It also follows from (7.65) that the observer's trajectory and its momentum transform as

$$\begin{aligned} [J_\Lambda, q^\mu(t)] &= \Lambda^\mu{}_\nu q^\nu(t), \qquad & [P_\varepsilon, q^\mu(t)] &= 0, \\ [J_\Lambda, p_\mu(t)] &= -\Lambda_\mu{}^\nu p_\nu(t), \qquad & [P_\varepsilon, p_\mu(t)] &= 0. \end{aligned} \tag{7.69}$$

Since the dynamics constraint $\mathcal{E}_M(t)$ is only defined for $|M| \leqslant p-2$, it transforms as

$$\begin{aligned} [J_\Lambda, \mathcal{E}_M(t)] &= \sum_{\substack{\mu \\ M_\mu \leqslant p-3}} \sum_{\substack{\nu \\ M_\nu \geqslant 1}} \eta_\mu \Lambda_{\mu\nu} M_\nu \phi_{M+\mu-\nu}(t), \\ [P_\varepsilon, \mathcal{E}_M(t)] &= - \sum_{\substack{\mu \\ M_\mu \leqslant p-3}} \varepsilon^\mu \phi_{M+\mu}(t). \end{aligned} \tag{7.70}$$

If we postulate the corrsponding transformation law for the antijet momentum,

$$\begin{aligned}
[J_\Lambda, \pi^*_M(t)] &= \sum_{\substack{\mu \\ M_\mu \leqslant p-3}} \sum_{\substack{\nu \\ M_\nu \geqslant 1}} \eta_\mu \Lambda_{\mu\nu}(M_\mu+1)\pi^*_{M+\mu-\nu}(t), \\
[P_\varepsilon, \pi^*_M(t)] &= \sum_{\substack{\mu \\ M_\mu \geqslant 1}} \varepsilon_\mu \pi^*_{M-\mu}(t),
\end{aligned} \tag{7.71}$$

the BRST charge Q_D commutes with the Poincaré generators. Analogously, we verify that the BRST charges Q_T and Q_R associated with $\mathcal{T}_M(t)$ and $\mathcal{R}_M(t)$ are Poincaré invariant; the only difference is that the sums have to be truncated at different values of $|M|$.

In contrast, the momentum constraint is not preserved by the full Poincaré algebra. This is obvious since the actions of P_ε in (7.67) and (7.68) differ. Hence it is impossible to make the momentum BRST operator $Q_\mathcal{M} = \sum_{k\in\mathcal{K}}(\mathcal{M}_k + \alpha_k)\gamma_{-k}$ commute with P_ε. The situation for Lorentz transformation is somewhat nicer. From

$$[J_\Lambda, \mathcal{M}_M(t)] = \sum_{\substack{\mu \\ M_\mu \leqslant p-1}} \sum_{\substack{\nu \\ M_\nu \geqslant 1}} \eta_\mu \Lambda_{\mu\nu}(M_\mu+1)\mathcal{M}_{M+\mu-\nu}(t), \tag{7.72}$$

it follows that

$$[J_\Lambda, \mathcal{M}^{(p)}_k] = \Lambda^\mu{}_\nu k_\mu \frac{\partial}{\partial k_\nu}\mathcal{M}^{(p)}_k, \tag{7.73}$$

as one expects from (7.64).

7.7 An alternative momentum constraint

In the previous subsection we learned that the momentum constraint $\mathcal{M}_k$ does not transform in a sensible way under translations. This is not necessarily fatal; dynamics is fully specified by the dynamics and time constraints, whereas the momentum constraint only relates canonical momenta to velocities. Nevertheless, it might be worthwhile to consider an alternative choice for the ϕ part of $\mathcal{M}_k$, which makes Poincaré invariance less badly broken.

Consider a plane wave defined by its Fourier transform

$$\phi_k = \int d^dx\ \phi(x)\mathrm{e}^{ik\cdot x}. \tag{7.74}$$

Formally expanding $\phi(x)$ in the Taylor series (7.1), we obtain

$$\phi_k = \mathrm{e}^{ik\cdot q}\sum_M (ik)^{-M-\mathbf{1}}\phi_M C_M, \tag{7.75}$$

where $\mathbf{1} = (1, 1, ..., 1)$ is the unit multi-index and the constants

$$C_M = \frac{1}{M!} \int dy\ \mathrm{e}^{iy} y^M \equiv \prod_\mu \frac{1}{M_\mu!} \int dy^\mu\ \mathrm{e}^{iy^\mu} (y^\mu)^{M_\mu}. \tag{7.76}$$

This formula arises from the substitution $y = k{\cdot}(x-q)$, i.e. $y^\mu = k_\mu(x^\mu - q^\mu)$. By integrating by parts and discarding boundary terms, we obtain $C_M = i^M M!\, C_0$. Hence we are led to define

$$\phi_k(t) = (-i)^d \sum_M^p (-ik)^{-M-\mathbf{1}} \int dt\ \mathrm{e}^{ik\cdot q(t)} \phi_M(t). \tag{7.77}$$

This expression clearly only makes sense if all $k_\mu \neq 0$. The corresponding dynamics and time constraints read

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{E}_k(t) &= -(k^2 - \omega^2)\phi_k(t) + k^2 \sum_{|M|=0}^{1} (-ik)^{-M-\mathbf{1}} \phi_M(t) \\
&\quad - \omega^2 \sum_{|M|=p-1}^{p} (-ik)^{-M-\mathbf{1}} \phi_M(t), \qquad (7.78)\\
\mathcal{T}_k(t) &= \dot\phi_k(t) - ik_\mu \dot q^\mu(t)\phi_k(t) - \sum_{|M|=p} (-ik)^{-M-\mathbf{1}} \dot\phi_M(t) + (-ik)^{-\mathbf{1}} \phi_M(t).
\end{aligned}$$

The linear combinations (7.77) hence behave like plane waves, apart from correction terms coming from the truncation to p-jets. Define

$$\pi_k(t) = \sum_M^p (-ik)^M \int dt\ \mathrm{e}^{ik\cdot q(t)} \pi_M(t). \tag{7.79}$$

The brackets read

$$[\phi_k(t), \pi_{k'}(t')] = i\delta_p(k, k')\delta(t - t'), \tag{7.80}$$

where the definition of $\delta_p(k, k')$ has been changed to

$$\delta_p(k, k') = (-1)^d \sum_M^p k^{-M-\mathbf{1}} k'^M. \tag{7.81}$$

In the limit $p \to \infty$

$$\delta_p(k, k') \to \prod_\mu \frac{1}{k'_\mu + k_\mu}. \tag{7.82}$$

If the sums over M and N would run over all $\mathbb{Z}^d$ rather than $\mathbb{N}^d$, $\delta_p(k, k')$ would approach $\delta^d(k + k')$ in the $p \to \infty$ limit.

Given the linear combinations (7.77) and (7.79), we can now give two alternative definitions for $\mathcal{M}_k(t)$:

$$\mathcal{M}_k(t) = \begin{cases} \pi_k(t) - \dot{\phi}_k(t), \\ \pi_k(t) - ik_\mu \dot{q}^\mu(t)\phi_k(t). \end{cases} \tag{7.83}$$

Their bracket becomes

$$[\mathcal{M}_k(t), \mathcal{M}_{k'}(t')] = \begin{cases} -i\delta_p(k, k')\dot{\delta}(t - t'), \\ (k_\mu - k'_\mu)\dot{q}^\mu(t)\delta_p(k, k')\delta(t - t'). \end{cases} \tag{7.84}$$

Hence the integrals $\mathcal{M}_k = \int dt\ \mathcal{M}_k(t)$ satisfy CCR of the form (7.12), with the definition of $\delta_p(k, k')$ changed from (7.14) to (7.82).

It is clear from the definition of $\phi_k(t)$ that the Poincaré algebra acts like

$$\begin{aligned} [J_\Lambda, \phi_k(t)] &= -\Lambda_{\mu\nu} k^\mu \frac{\partial}{\partial k_\nu} \phi_k(t) + ..., \\ [P_\varepsilon, \phi_k(t)] &= -\varepsilon^\mu k_\mu \phi_k(t) + ..., \end{aligned} \tag{7.85}$$

where the ellipses stand for correction terms involving $\phi_M(t)$ with $|M|$ close to p and zero. $\pi_k(t)$ and $\mathcal{M}_k(t)$ transform in the same way. This definition of the momentum constraint thus appears to be manifestly covariant up to correction terms which can be ignored in the limit $p \to \infty$. Note however that the variable k is restricted to the discrete index set $\mathcal{K}$, and that a finite Poincaré transformation in general takes us outside this set. $\mathcal{K}$ becomes dense in the invariantly defined surface $k^2 = \omega^2$ when $p \to \infty$, and one may argue that manifest covariance is recovered in this limit.

That one must give up manifest Poincaré covariance is a disappointment; as the name indicates, combining canonical quantization with manifest covariance was a major goal with MCCQ. However, Poincaré covariance is only broken by the momentum constraint. Since the dynamics and time constraints are manifestly covariant (even general-covariant in the gravity context), as is quantization in the sense of eliminating negative-frequency modes, dynamics and quantization are defined in a manifestly covariant way. Only the definition of canonical momenta in terms of velocities break manifest covariance.

Therefore, we are led to a weaker definition of covariance in QJT(p). The history phase space $J^p\mathcal{HP}$ carries a well-defined representation of the covariance algebra, and the BRST operator Q_{TOT} splits into two terms, the dynamics part $Q_D + Q_T + Q_R + Q_q$ (plus additional terms in the presence of gauge symmetries), and the momentum part $Q_{\mathcal{M}}$. The former is manifestly covariant in the sense that this BRST charge commutes with the covariance generators, but the latter is not. Despite its weakened form, the requirement is still quite strong. In particular, $H^\bullet(Q_D + Q_T + Q_R + Q_q)$ only carries a well-defined (necessarily projective) action of diffeomorphism and gauge algebra if the history phase space is a space of trajectories in jet space; this is clear from [7].

7.8 Discussion

To conclude the treatment of the free field within QJT, let us review the most important lessons:

- QJT(p) gives a p-jet approximation $J^p\mathfrak{H}$ to the physical Hilbert space, and the correct Hilbert space $\mathfrak{H}$ should only arise in the $p \to \infty$ limit. This is unlike the single harmonic oscillator, where $J^p\mathfrak{H} = \mathfrak{H}$ for all p.
- QFT is recovered in the limit as QJT(∞), but only in the limit that the observer's mass is infinite. The observer's position and velocities are c-numbers only if $M_{obs} = \infty$. Quantization is hence taken more seriously in QJT then in QFT, because not only the fields but also the observer's trajectory (and hence the operational definition of time) are quantized.
- Reparametrizations become problematic. Not only does the reparametrization algebra acquire a central extension in QJT(p), but the extension diverges in the field limit $p \to \infty$.
- The Poincaré algebra does not act in a well-defined manner in QJT(p). The problems are located to the momentum constraint; dynamics and quantization are implemented in a manifestly covariant way.

8 Free Maxwell field

8.1 History formulation

We now turn to the free Maxwell field, which is also described by a free theory. The new feature here is that the model has a local $U(1)$ gauge symmetry, which on the Lie algebra level is described by the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{map}(d, \mathfrak{u}(1))$ of maps from d-dimensional spacetime to $\mathfrak{u}(1)$. This algebra has generators $\mathcal{J}_X$, where $X(x)$ is an arbitrary function on spacetime, and brackets $[\mathcal{J}_X, \mathcal{J}_Y] = 0$.

The dynamical degree of freedom is a gauge potential $A_\mu(x)$, which transforms under $\mathfrak{map}(d, u(1))$ as

$$[\mathcal{J}_X, A_\mu(x)] = -i\partial_\mu X(x). \tag{8.1}$$

The canonical conjugate of $A_\mu(x)$ is denoted by $E^\mu(x)$; it will eventually be identified with the electric field strength. The gauge field $F_{\mu\nu}(x) = \partial_\mu A_\nu(x) - \partial_\nu A_\mu(x)$ is clearly gauge invariant, $[\mathcal{J}_X, F_{\mu\nu}(x)] = 0$. In Fourier space, the gauge potential has components $A_\mu(k)$ and the field strength is $F_{\mu\nu}(k) = k_\mu A_\nu(k) - k_\nu A_\mu(k)$. The dynamics constraint

$$\mathcal{E}_\mu(k) = k^\nu F_{\nu\mu}(k) = k^2 A_\mu(k) - k_\mu k^\nu A_\nu(k), \tag{8.2}$$

is subject to the redundancy

$$k^\mu \mathcal{E}_\mu(k) = k^\mu k^\nu F_{\mu\nu}(k) \equiv 0. \tag{8.3}$$

The gauge algebra is generated by the Gauss law constraint

$$\mathcal{J}(k) = k_\mu E^\mu(k) \approx 0. \tag{8.4}$$

In Fourier space, the gauge generators can be written $\mathcal{J}_X = \int d^4k\, X(k)\mathcal{J}(-k)$. The potential transforms as $[\mathcal{J}_X, A_\mu(k)] = ik_\mu X(k)$ and the field strength is gauge invariance: $[\mathcal{J}_X, F_{\mu\nu}(k)] = 0$.

We introduce standard polarization vectors $\epsilon^{(i)}_\mu(k)$, $i = 0, 1, 2, 3$. If k is the wave-vector for a photon travelling in the $\mu = 3$ direction, $k = (|k|, 0, 0, |k|)$, we have $k^\mu \epsilon^{(0)}_\mu(k) = -k^\mu \epsilon^{(3)}_\mu(k) = |k|$. It is convenient to introduce lightcone coordinates

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon^{(+)}_\mu(k) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\epsilon^0_\mu(k) + \epsilon^{(3)}_\mu(k)) = \frac{k_\mu}{|k|}, \\ \epsilon^{(-)}_\mu(k) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\epsilon^0_\mu(k) - \epsilon^{(3)}_\mu(k)). \end{aligned} \tag{8.5}$$

These polarization vectors satisfy the relations

$$\begin{aligned} k^\mu \epsilon^{(i)}_\mu(k) = 0, \text{ for } i = +, 1, 2, \qquad & k^\mu \epsilon^{(-)}_\mu(k) = |k|, \\ \epsilon^{(i)\mu}(k)\epsilon^{(j)}_\mu(k) = \eta^{ij}, \qquad & \eta_{ij}\epsilon^{(i)\mu}(k)\epsilon^{(j)}_\nu(k) = \delta^\mu_\nu, \end{aligned} \tag{8.6}$$

where $\eta^{++} = \eta^{--} = 0$, $\eta^{+-} = \eta^{-+} = 1$.

Finally, we define the momentum constraint,

$$\mathcal{M}_\mu(k) = E_\mu(k) - F_{\mu 0}(k) = E_\mu(k) - k_\mu A_0(k) + k_0 A_\mu(k). \tag{8.7}$$

Since $\mathcal{M}_\mu(k)$ only depends on quantities which transform homogeneously (even trivially) under gauge transformations, the momentum constraint also has this property. Most components of the momentum constraints don't commute with the dynamics constraint (8.2); rather

$$[\mathcal{M}_\mu(k), \mathcal{E}_\nu(k')] = -i(k^2\eta_{\mu\nu} - k_\mu k_\nu)\delta(k+k'). \tag{8.8}$$

However, the combinations

$$\mathcal{M}^{(i)}(k) = \eta^{\mu\nu}\epsilon^{(i)}_\mu(k)\mathcal{M}_\nu(k) \tag{8.9}$$

do commute with the dynamics constraint, provided that $k^2 = 0$ and $i = +, 1, 2$. These constraints are second class, since they do not commute among themselves

$$[\mathcal{M}^{(i)}(k), \mathcal{M}^{(j)}(k')] = 2ik_0\eta^{ij}\delta(k+k'). \tag{8.10}$$

To fix this defect, we introduce oscillators $\alpha^{(i)}(k)$, also defined for $k^2 = 0$ and $i = 1, 2$; no momentum constraint is needed for the $i = +$ component because it is a gauge degree of freedom. The α's satisfy the CCR

$$[\alpha^{(i)}(k), \alpha^{(j)}(k)] = -2ik_0\eta^{ij}\delta(k+k'). \tag{8.11}$$

Hence the improved momentum constraints $\mathcal{M}^{(i)}(k) + \alpha^{(i)}(k)$ commute both with the dynamics constraints and among themselves.

8.2 Cohomological construction

We now proceed to the cohomological construction of the physical phase space $\mathcal{P}$. For all values of k, we introduce antifields and momenta according to the following table.

Field	Momentum	Parity	Constraint
$A_\mu(k)$	$E^\mu(-k)$	B	
$A^*_\mu(k)$	$E^\mu_*(-k)$	F	$\mathcal{E}_\mu(k)$
$\zeta(k)$	$\xi(-k)$	B	$k^\mu A^*_\mu(k)$
$c(k)$	$b(-k)$	F	$k_\mu E^\mu(k)$

(8.12)

Moreover, for $k^2 = 0$, $i = 1, 2$, we introduce also the following antifields and momenta:

Field	Momentum	Parity	Constraint
$\theta^{(i)}(k)$	$\chi_{(i)}(-k)$	B	$\epsilon^{(i)\mu}(k)A^*_\mu(k)$
$\beta^{(i)}(k)$	$\gamma_{(i)}(-k)$	F	$\mathcal{M}^{(i)}(k) + \alpha^{(i)}(k)$
$c^*(k)$	$b_*(-k)$	B	$k_\mu E^\mu_*(k)$
$\alpha^{(i)}(k)$	$\alpha^{(i)}(-k)$	B	$-$

(8.13)

The BRST charge is $Q = Q_D + Q_S + Q_G + Q_A + Q_{GA} + Q_{\mathcal{M}}$, where

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_D &= \int d^4k\ k^\nu F_{\nu\mu}(k)E^\mu_*(-k), \\
Q_S &= \int d^4k\ k^\mu A^*_\mu(k)\xi(-k), \\
Q_G &= \int d^4k\ k_\mu E^\mu(k)c(-k), \\
Q_{GA} &= \int d^4k\ k_\mu E^\mu_*(k)c^*(-k)\delta(k^2), \\
Q_A &= \sum_{i=1}^{2}\int d^4k\ \epsilon^{(i)\mu}(k)A^*_\mu(k)\chi_{(i)}(-k)\delta(k^2), \\
Q_{\mathcal{M}} &= \sum_{i=1}^{2}\int d^4k\ \big(\epsilon^{(i)}_\mu(k)(E^\mu(k) - F^{\mu 0}(k)) + \alpha^{(i)}(k)\big)\gamma_{(i)}(-k)\delta(k^2).
\end{aligned} \tag{8.14}$$

Using the properties (8.6) of the polariation vectors, it is straightforward to prove that $Q^2 = 0$. The BRST operator acts on the fields and antifields as

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta c(k) &= 0, \\
\delta A_\mu(k) &= ik_\mu c(k) - i\sum_{i=1}^{2}\epsilon^{(i)}_\mu(-k)\gamma_{(i)}(k)\delta(k^2), \\
\delta A^*_\mu(k) &= k^2 A_\mu(k) - k_\mu k^\nu A_\nu(k), \\
\delta\zeta(k) &= ik^\mu A^*_\mu(k), \\
\delta\theta^{(i)}(k) &= -i\epsilon^{(i)\mu}(k)A^*_\mu(k)\delta(k^2), \\
\delta\beta^{(i)}(k) &= \big(\epsilon^{(i)}_\mu(k)(E^\mu(k) - F^{\mu 0}(k)) + \alpha^{(i)}(k)\big)\delta(k^2), \\
\delta\alpha^{(i)}(k) &= 2ik_0\gamma_{(i)}(k)\delta(k^2).
\end{aligned} \tag{8.15}$$

where antifields with parenthesized indices (i) are only defined for $k^2 = 0$ and $i = 1, 2$. Q acts on the conjugate momenta as

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta b(k) &= -ik_\mu E^\mu(k), \\
\delta E^\mu(k) &= i(k^2 E^\mu_*(k) - k^\mu k_\nu E^\nu_*(k)) - ik^0 \epsilon^{(i)\mu}(k)\gamma_{(i)}(k)\delta(k^2), \\
\delta E^\mu_*(k) &= -k^\mu \xi(k) + \sum_{i=1}^{2} \epsilon^{(i)\mu}(k)\chi_{(i)}(-k)\delta(k^2), \\
\delta\xi(k) &= 0, \\
\delta\chi^{(i)}(k) &= 0, \\
\delta\gamma_{(i)}(k) &= 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{8.16}$$

The cohomology is computed along the lines above. If $k^2 \neq 0$, both the kernel and the image are generated by $c(k)$, $k^\mu A^*_\mu(k)$, $\xi(k)$, and $k_\mu E^\mu_*(k)$, and by $\epsilon^{(i)}_\mu E^\mu_*(k)$ and $\epsilon^{(i)\mu}(k)A_\mu(k)$, for $i = +, 1, 2$. Thus there is no contribution to $H^\bullet_{cl}(Q)$ for $k^2 \neq 0$.

For $k^2 = 0$, it is convenient to define

$$\begin{aligned}
A^{(i)}(k) &= \epsilon^{(i)\mu}(k)A_\mu(k), & A^{(i)}_*(k) &= \epsilon^{(i)\mu}(k)A^*_\mu(k), \\
E^{(i)}(k) &= \epsilon^{(i)}_\mu(k)E^\mu(k), & E^{(i)}_*(k) &= \epsilon^{(i)}_\mu(k)E^\mu_*(k).
\end{aligned} \tag{8.17}$$

It follows that

$$k^\mu A_\mu(k) = |k|A^{(+)}(k). \tag{8.18}$$

The relevant parts of (8.15) and (8.16) become for $i = +, -$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta c(k) &= 0, & \delta b(k) &= |k|E^{(+)}(k), \\
\delta A^{(-)}(k) &= i|k|c(k), & \delta E^{(-)}(k) &= -i|k|^2 E^{(+)}_*(k), \\
\delta A^{(-)}_*(k) &= |k|^2 A^{(+)}(k), & \delta E^{(-)}_*(k) &= -|k|\xi(k), \\
\delta\zeta(k) &= i|k|A^{(+)}_*(k), & \delta\xi(k) &= 0, \\
\delta A^{(+)}(k) = \delta A^{(+)}_*(k) &= 0, & \delta E^{(+)}(k) = \delta E^{(+)}_*(k) &= 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{8.19}$$

Hence both the kernel and the image consist of $A^{(+)}(k)$, $A^{(+)}_*(k)$, $E^{(+)}(k)$, $E^{(+)}_*(k)$, $c(k)$ and $\xi(k)$, and all fields vanish in cohomology; the longitudinal and temporal parts of the gauge connection are unphysical.

In constrast, for $i = 1, 2$, the relevant parts of (8.15) and (8.16) become

$$\begin{aligned} \delta A^{(i)}(k) &= -i\gamma^{(i)}(k)\delta(k^2), & \delta E^{(i)}(k) &= i\gamma^{(i)}(k)\delta(k^2), \\ \delta A_*^{(i)}(k) &= 0, & \delta E_*^{(i)}(k) &= \chi^{(i)}(-k)\delta(k^2), \\ \delta\theta^{(i)}(k) &= -iA_*^{(i)}(k)\delta(k^2), & \delta\chi^{(i)}(k) &= 0, \\ \delta\beta^{(i)}(k) &= (\mathcal{M}^{(i)}(k) + \alpha^{(i)}(k))\delta(k^2), & \delta\gamma^{(i)}(k) &= 0, \\ \delta\alpha^{(i)}(k) &= 2ik_0\gamma^{(i)}(k)\delta(k^2). \end{aligned} \tag{8.20}$$

The kernel consists of $E^{(i)}(k) + k_0A^{(i)}(k)$, $\mathcal{M}^{(i)}(k) + \alpha^{(i)}(k)$, $A_*^{(i)}(k)$ and $\gamma^{(i)}(k)$, and all combinations except for the first also belong to the image. The cohomology $H^\bullet_{cl}(Q)$ is thus generated by

$$a^{(i)}(k) = E^{(i)}(k) + k_0A^{(i)}(k) + x(\mathcal{M}^{(i)}(k) + \alpha^{(i)}(k)) \tag{8.21}$$

for all $k^2 = 0$ and $i = 1, 2$, where x is an arbitrary constant. These are identified with creation and annihilation operators for photons, depending on the sign of k_0. We verify that they satisfy the CCR

$$[a^{(i)}(k), a^{(j)}(k')] = 2ik_0\eta^{ij}\delta(k + k'), \tag{8.22}$$

independent of the value of x.

The above analysis is slightly flawed, because there is additional cohomology for $k = 0$ (rather than just $k^2 = 0$), i.e. for soft photons. This unwanted cohomology could be eliminated by introducing additional antifields and ghosts, and adding new terms to the BRST operator.

We can now quantize by introducing a vacuum which is annihilated by all oscillators with $k_0 < 0$; there is some ambiguity with modes with $k_0 = 0$, which was irrelevant for the scalar field because it has a mass gap. Otherwise, the treatment is completely analogous to the non-covariant history quantization of the free scalar field in section 5.

8.3 Maxwell field in QJT

Expand the gauge field in a Taylor series

$$A_\mu(x) = \sum_M^p \frac{1}{M!} A_{\mu,M}(t)(x - q(t))^M. \tag{8.23}$$

The canonical momentum is defined by the non-zero CCR

$$[A_{\mu,M}(t), E_{\nu,N}(t')] = i\eta_{\mu\nu}\delta(t - t'). \tag{8.24}$$

The field strength corresponds to the jet

$$F_{\mu\nu,M}(t) \equiv F_{\mu\nu,M}(A;t) = A_{\nu,M+\mu}(t) - A_{\mu,M+\nu}(t). \tag{8.25}$$

The dynamics constraint,

$$\mathcal{E}_{\mu,M}(t) = \sum_\nu F_{\mu\nu,M+\nu}(t) = \sum_\nu A_{\nu,M+\mu+\nu}(t) - \sum_\nu \eta_\nu\, A_{\mu,M+2\nu}(t), \tag{8.26}$$

has the redundancy

$$\sum_\mu \mathcal{E}_{\mu,M+\mu}(t) = 0. \tag{8.27}$$

The corresponding gauge generators,

$$\mathcal{J}_M(t) = \sum_\mu E^\mu_{M-\mu}(t), \tag{8.28}$$

commute with $E^\mu_M(t)$, $F_{\mu\nu,M}(t)$ and the dynamics constraint and acts as follows on the gauge field:

$$[\mathcal{J}_M(t), A_{\nu,N}(t')] = -i\eta_{M-\nu,N}\delta(t-t'). \tag{8.29}$$

The gauge algebra takes the form

$$[\mathcal{J}_M(t), \mathcal{J}_N(t')] = 0. \tag{8.30}$$

Alternatively, we could smear the generators with functions on spacetime $X(x)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^4$:

$$\mathcal{J}_X = \sum_M^p \int dt\ \partial_M X(q(t))\mathcal{J}_M(t), \tag{8.31}$$

where ∂_M, $M = (M_0, M_1, ..., M_{d-1})$, denotes the mixed partial derivitives:

$$\partial_M X(x) \equiv \underbrace{\partial_0..\partial_0}_{M_0}\underbrace{\partial_1..\partial_1}_{M_1}..\underbrace{\partial_{d-1}..\partial_{d-1}}_{M_{d-1}} X(x). \tag{8.32}$$

In this case, (8.29) is replaced by

$$[\mathcal{J}_X, A_{\mu,M}(t)] = -i\partial_{M+\mu}X(q(t)). \tag{8.33}$$

For any jet $\phi_M(t)$ with reparametrization weight $\mathrm{wt}\,\phi_M(t) = 0$, we define

$$D\phi_M(t) \equiv \dot{\phi}_M(t) - \sum_\mu \dot{q}^\mu(t)\phi_{M+\mu}(t). \tag{8.34}$$

The time constraint is defined by

$$\mathcal{T}_{\mu,M}(t) = DA_{\mu,M}(t) \equiv \dot{A}_{\mu,M}(t) - \sum_\nu \dot{q}^\nu(t)A_{\mu,M+\nu}(t). \tag{8.35}$$

The time constraint does not commute with the gauge generators $\mathcal{J}_M(t)$; instead,

$$[\mathcal{J}_M(t), \mathcal{T}_{\nu,N}(t')] = i\eta_{M,N+\nu}\dot{\delta}(t-t') + i\sum_\rho \dot{q}^\rho(t)\eta_{M,N+\nu+\rho}\delta(t-t'). \tag{8.36}$$

However, the smeared generators do commute with the time constraint,

$$[\mathcal{J}_X, \mathcal{T}_{\nu,N}(t')] = 0, \tag{8.37}$$

because $\dot{X}_{N+\nu}(q(t)) = \sum_\rho \dot{q}^\rho(t)X_{N+\nu+\rho}(q(t))$.

Since the observer's trajectory points in the time direction, we can use it instead of the fixed time direction "0". Hence we replace $\delta^\mu_0 \to \dot{q}^\mu(t)$ in all formulas. New polarization vectors are defined by

$$\begin{aligned}
\epsilon^{(+)}_\mu(k,\dot{q}) &= k_\mu, \\
\epsilon^{(-)}_\mu(k,\dot{q}) &= k_\mu - \frac{2k_\nu\dot{q}^\nu}{M^2_{obs}}\dot{q}_\mu, \\
\epsilon^{(i)}_\mu(k,\dot{q})\epsilon^{(+)\mu}(k,\dot{q}) &= \epsilon^{(i)}_\mu(k,\dot{q})\epsilon^{(-)\mu}(k,\dot{q}) = 0, \quad i = 1,2.
\end{aligned} \tag{8.38}$$

These polarization vectors satisfy the relations

$$\begin{gathered}
k^\mu\epsilon^{(i)}_\mu(k,\dot{q}) = 0, \text{ for } i = +,1,2, \qquad k^\mu\epsilon^{(-)}_\mu(k,\dot{q}) = k_\mu\dot{q}^\mu(t) \equiv |k|, \\
\epsilon^{(i)\mu}(k)\epsilon^{(j)}_\mu(k) = \eta^{ij}, \text{ for } i = 1,2, \qquad \epsilon^{(+)}_\mu(k,\dot{q})\epsilon^{(-)\mu}(k,\dot{q}) = 1, \\
\epsilon^{(+)}_\mu(k,\dot{q})\epsilon^{(+)\mu}(k,\dot{q}) = \epsilon^{(-)}_\mu(k,\dot{q})\epsilon^{(-)\mu}(k,\dot{q}) = 0
\end{gathered} \tag{8.39}$$

We want to relate the electric field to the field strength by a relation $E_\mu = F_{\mu 0}$. We take the momentum constraint to be

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mu,M}(t) = E_{\mu,M}(t) - \frac{1}{M!}\sum_\nu \dot{q}^\nu(t)F_{\mu\nu,M}(t), \tag{8.40}$$

which is defined for $|M| \leqslant p-1$. Modulo the time constraint, this is equivalent to the choice

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mu,M}(t) = E_{\mu,M}(t) + \frac{1}{M!}\dot{A}_{\mu,M}(t) - \frac{1}{M!}\sum_{\nu} \dot{q}^{\nu}(t) A_{\nu,M+\mu}(t). \tag{8.41}$$

The momentum constraint clearly commutes with the gauge algebra, $[\mathcal{J}_M(t), \mathcal{M}_{\nu,N}(t')] = 0$, since $\mathcal{J}_M(t)$ commutes with the field strength. Moreover, the combinations

$$\mathcal{M}^{(i)}(k) = \sum_{M}^{p-1} (-ik)^M \int dt\ \mathrm{e}^{ik\cdot q(t)} \epsilon^{(i)\mu}(k, \dot{q}(t)) \mathcal{M}_{\mu,M}(t), \tag{8.42}$$

where $k^2 = 0$ and $i = +, 1, 2$, also commutes with the dynamics and time constraints. We verify that these generators satisfy the algebra

$$\begin{aligned} & [\mathcal{M}^{(i)}(k), \mathcal{M}^j j(k')] = \sigma^{ij}(k,k') = -\sigma^{ji}(k',k) \\ \equiv\ & \sum_{M}^{p-1} (-ik)^M (-ik')^M \times \\ & \times \int dt\ \mathrm{e}^{ik\cdot q(t)} \epsilon^{(i)}_{\mu}(k, \dot{q}(t)) \epsilon^{(j)}_{\nu}(k', \dot{q}(t)) (\dot{q}^{\nu}(t) k'_{\mu} - \dot{q}^{\mu}(t) k_{\nu}). \end{aligned} \tag{8.43}$$

We take the BRST operator to be $Q_A + Q_D + Q_S + Q_T + Q_{GT} + Q_{DT} +$

$Q_{ST} + Q_{\mathcal{M}}$, where

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_A &= \sum_M^p \int dt\ c_{M+\mu}(t) E^\mu_M(t), \\
Q_D &= \sum_M^{p-2} \int dt\ \sum_\nu F_{\nu\mu,M+\nu}(A(t)) E^{*\mu}_M(t), \\
Q_S &= \sum_M^{p-3} \int dt\ \sum_\mu A^*_{\mu,M+\mu}(t) \xi_M(t), \\
Q_{GT} &= \sum_M^p \int dt\ Dc_M(t) \bar{b}_M(t), \qquad (8.44) \\
Q_{AT} &= \sum_M^{p-1} \int dt\ (DA_{\mu,M}(t) - \bar{c}_{M+\mu}(t)) \bar{E}^\mu_M(t), \\
Q_{DT} &= \sum_M^{p-3} \int dt\ (DA^*_{\mu,M}(t) - \sum_\nu \eta_\nu\, F_{\nu\mu,M+\nu}(\bar{A}(t))) \bar{E}^{*\mu}_M(t), \\
Q_{ST} &= \sum_M^{p-4} \int dt\ (D\zeta_{\mathbf{M}}(t) - \sum_\mu \eta_\mu\, \bar{A}^*_{\mu,M+\mu}(t)) \bar{\xi}_M(t), \\
Q_{\mathcal{M}} &= \sum_{i=1}^2 \sum_{k\in\mathcal{K}} (\mathcal{M}^{(i)}(k) + \alpha^{(i)}(k)) \gamma_{(i)}(k),
\end{aligned}$$

It is straightforward to verify that $Q^2 = 0$, using e.g.

$$\begin{aligned}
\{Q_A, Q_D\} &= \sum_M \int \sum_\nu (\eta_\nu\, c_{M+\mu+2\nu}(t) - \eta_\nu\, c_{M+\nu+\mu+\nu}(t)) E^{*\mu}_M(t), \\
\{Q_{GT}, Q_{AT}\} &= -\{Q_A, Q_{AT}\} = i \int Dc_{M+\mu}(t) \bar{E}^\mu_M(t), \qquad (8.45) \\
\{Q_{AT}, Q_{DT}\} &= -\{Q_D, Q_{DT}\} = i \int \sum_\nu F_{\nu\mu,M+\nu}(DA(t)) \bar{E}^{*\mu}_M(t).
\end{aligned}$$

8.4 Solution of cohomology

We first consider the unbarred jets and antijets. Ignoring the momentum constraint, the BRST operator acts as

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta c_M(t) &= 0, \\
\delta A_{\mu,M}(t) &= -ic_{M+\mu}(t), \\
\delta A^*_{\mu,M}(t) &= \sum_\nu \eta_\nu\, F_{\nu\mu,M+\nu}(t) = \sum_\nu \eta_\nu\,(A_{\mu,M+2\nu}(t) - A_{\nu,M+\mu+\nu}(t)), \\
\delta\zeta_M(t) &= -i\sum_\mu \eta_\mu\, A^*_{\mu,M+\mu}(t) \equiv -i\mathrm{div}A^*_M(t).
\end{aligned} \tag{8.46}$$

The kernel is generated by $c_M(t)$, $\mathrm{div}A^*_M(t)$, and gauge invariant functionals of $A_{\mu,M}(t)$, i.e. functionals of $F_{\mu\nu,M}(t)$. The image is generated by $c_M(t)$, $\mathrm{div}A^*_M(t)$, and $\mathcal{E}_{\mu,M}(t) = \sum_\nu \eta_\nu\, F_{\nu\mu,M+\nu}(t)$. Hence the cohomology is generated by the equivalence classes

$$F_{\mu\nu,M}(t) + x^\rho_{\mu\nu}\mathcal{E}_{\rho,M}(t), \tag{8.47}$$

where $x^\rho_{\mu\nu}$ are arbitary.

Introduce the linear combinations

$$\begin{aligned}
c_k(t) &= \sum_M^{p+1}(ik)^{-M}c_M(t), & A^*_{\mu,k}(t) &= \sum_M^{p-2}(ik)^{-M}A^*_{\mu,M}(t), \\
A_{\mu,k}(t) &= \sum_M^{p}(ik)^{-M}A_{\mu,M}(t), & \zeta_k(t) &= \sum_M^{p-3}(ik)^{-M}\zeta_M(t).
\end{aligned} \tag{8.48}$$

Equation (8.46) then takes the form to

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta c_k(t) &= 0, \\
\delta A_{\mu,k}(t) &= k_\mu c_k(t), \\
\delta A^*_{\mu,k}(t) &= (k^2\delta^\nu_\mu - k_\mu k^\nu)A_{\nu,k}(t), \\
\delta\zeta_k(t) &= k^\mu A^*_{\mu,k}(t),
\end{aligned} \tag{8.49}$$

which we recognize as (8.15). Hence the transverse photons

$$A^{(i)}_k(t) = \epsilon^{(i)\mu}(k,\dot q(t))A_{\mu,k}(t), \quad \text{where } k^2 = 0,\ i = 1,2, \tag{8.50}$$

belong to the physical operators. As usual, these expressions are not all linearly independent, because the $A^{(i)}_k(t)$ are linear combinations of the $(d-$

$2)\binom{d+p}{d}$ modes $A_{\mu,M}(t)$, where we generalized to d dimensions. Therefore, the cohomology is generated by $A^{(i)}_k(t)$, where k, $k^2 = 0$, belongs to an index set $\mathcal{K}$. The $k \in \mathcal{K}$ must be linearly independent, but $\mathcal{K}$ is otherwise arbitrary. Since $\dim \mathcal{K} = r_{p,d}$, the number of independent modes equals $(d-2)r_{p,d}$.

We next consider the momenta corresponding to the jets in (8.46). The BRST charge acts as

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta b_M(t) &= \sum_\mu \eta_\mu\, E^\mu_{M-\mu}(t) \equiv \mathrm{div} E^\mu_M(t), \\
\delta E^\mu_M(t) &= \sum_\nu i(\eta_\nu\, E^{*\mu}_{M-2\nu}(t) - E^{*\nu}_{M-\mu-\nu}(t)) \equiv i F^{\mu\nu}_{\nu,M}(E^*(t)), \\
\delta E^{*\mu}_M(t) &= \xi_{M-\mu}(t), \\
\delta \xi_M(t) &= 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{8.51}$$

Introducing the linear combinations

$$\begin{aligned}
b_k(t) = \sum_M^{p+1} (-ik)^M b_M(t), \qquad E^{*\mu}_k(t) = \sum_M^{p-2} (-ik)^M E^{*\mu}_M(t), \\
E^\mu_k(t) = \sum_M^{p} (-ik)^M E^\mu_M(t), \qquad \xi_k(t) = \sum_M^{p-3} (-ik)^M \xi_M(t),
\end{aligned} \tag{8.52}$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta b_k(t) &= -ik_\mu E^\mu_k(t), \\
\delta E^\mu_k(t) &= i(k^2 \delta^\mu_\nu - k^\mu k_\nu) E^{*\nu}_k(t), \\
\delta E^{*\mu}_k(t) &= -ik^\mu \xi_k(t), \\
\delta \xi_k(t) &= 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{8.53}$$

Again, this is recognized as (8.16), and the cohomology is generated by the transverse electric field

$$E^{(i)}_k(t) = \epsilon^{(i)}_\mu(k, \dot q(t)) E^\mu_k(t), \quad \text{where } k \in \mathcal{K},\ i = 1, 2. \tag{8.54}$$

We now turn to the barred antijets. The BRST operator (8.44) acts like

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta \bar c_M(t) &= -iD c_M(t), \\
\delta \bar A_{\mu,M}(t) &= D A_{\mu,M}(t) - \bar c_{M+\mu}(t), \\
\delta \bar A^*_{\mu,M}(t) &= -i(D A^*_{\mu,M}(t) - \sum_\nu \eta_\nu\, F_{\nu\mu,M+\nu}(\bar A(t))), \\
\delta \bar\zeta_M(t) &= D\zeta_M(t) - \sum_\mu \eta_\mu\, \bar A^*_{\mu,M+\mu}(t).
\end{aligned} \tag{8.55}$$

This is completely analogous to how the time constraint eliminates the t dependence for the free scalar field. Morally, the barred antifields implement the constraint $DA_{\mu,M}(t) \approx 0$, i.e. $\dot{A}_{\mu,M}(t) \approx \sum_\nu \dot{q}^\nu(t) A_{\mu,M}(t)$ for the physical components of the A-field. In order to implement this constraint consistently, we also need to impose constraints on the other unbarred antijets. Analogously, the barred antijet momenta are eliminated through

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta \bar{b}_M(t) &= \sum_\mu \eta_\mu \, \bar{E}^\mu_{M-\mu}(t), \\
\delta \bar{E}^\mu_M(t) &= i \sum_\nu (\eta_\nu \, \bar{E}^{*\mu}_{M-2\nu}(t) - \bar{E}^{*\nu}_{M-\mu-\nu}(t)), \\
\delta \bar{E}^{*\mu}_M(t) &= \bar{\xi}_{M-\mu}(t), \\
\delta \bar{\xi}_M(t) &= 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{8.56}$$

So far, we have calculated the cohomology $H^\bullet_{cl}(Q_A + Q_D + Q_S + Q_T + Q_{GT} + Q_{DT} + Q_{ST})$, and found that H^0 is generated by transverse modes $E^{(i)}_k$ and $A^{(i)}_k$, where $i = 1, 2$ and $k \in \mathcal{K}$. To construct the p-jet approximation to the true physical phase space $J^p\mathcal{P}$, we finally need to identify the velocities $\sum_\nu \dot{q}^\nu(t) F^{\mu\nu}_k(t)$, where

$$F^{\mu\nu}_k(t) = \sum_M^p (ik)^{-M} F^{\mu\nu}_M(t), \tag{8.57}$$

with the momenta $E^\mu_k(t)$. This task is accomplished by the momentum constraint (8.42), exactly as for the free scalar field. $C(J^p\mathcal{P})$ is hence generated by p-jet approximations to transverse photons,

$$a^{(i)}(k) \propto \sum_\mu \int dt \; \epsilon^{(i)}_\mu(k, \dot{q}(t)) (E^\mu_k(t) - \sum_\nu \dot{q}_\nu(t) F^{\mu\nu}_k(t)), \tag{8.58}$$

for $i = 1, 2$ and $k \in \mathcal{K}$.

8.5 Hamiltonian and quantization

The physical Hamiltonian in $\mathcal{HP}^*$ is given by $\mathcal{H}_A = \mathcal{H}^0_A + \mathcal{H}^1_A$, where

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{H}^0_A \;=\; & \int dt \, \Big(-i \sum_M^{p+1} \dot{c}_M(t) b_M(t) + \sum_M^{p} \dot{A}_{\mu,M}(t) E^\mu_M(t) \\
& - i \sum_M^{p-2} \dot{A}^*_{\mu,M}(t) E^{*\mu}_M(t) + \sum_M^{p-3} \dot{\zeta}_M(t) \xi_M(t) \\
& + \sum_M^{p} \frac{d}{dt} \bar{c}_M(t) \bar{b}_M(t) - i \sum_M^{p-1} \frac{d}{dt} \bar{A}_{\mu,M}(t) \bar{E}^\mu_M(t) \\
& + \sum_M^{p-3} \frac{d}{dt} \bar{A}^*_{\mu,M}(t) \bar{E}^{*\mu}_M(t) - i \sum_M^{p-4} \frac{d}{dt} \bar{\zeta}_M(t) \bar{\xi}_M(t) \Big).
\end{aligned} \tag{8.59}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{H}^1_A \;=\; & \int dt \, \sum_\nu q^\nu_*(t) \Big(-i \sum_M^{p+1} c_{M+\nu}(t) \bar{b}_M(t) + \sum_M^{p} \int dt \; A_{\mu,M+\nu}(t) \bar{E}^\mu_M(t) \\
& - i \sum_M^{p-2} A^*_{\mu,M+\nu}(t) \bar{E}^{*\mu}_M(t) + \sum_M^{p-3} \zeta_{M+\nu}(t) \bar{\xi}_M(t) \Big).
\end{aligned} \tag{8.60}$$

Unlike the total Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}_{TOT} = \mathcal{H}^0_A + \mathcal{H}_\phi$, which translates both the fields and the observer's trajectory in time, the physical Hamiltonian translates the fields relative to the observer. We have e.g. $[H_A, A_{\mu,k}(t)] = -i\dot{A}_{\mu,k}(t)$ and $[H_A, E^\mu_k(t)] = -i\dot{E}^\mu_k(t)$, and hence

$$[H_A, a^{(i)}(k)] = k_\mu \int dt \; \dot{q}^\mu(t) \mathrm{e}^{ik\cdot q(t)} a^{(i)}_k(t) = k_\mu u^\mu a^{(i)}(k), \tag{8.61}$$

where we used that the solution to the observer's dynamics constraint is $q^\mu(t) \approx u^\mu t + s^\mu$. The physical Hamiltonian thus picks out the projection of k along the observer's trajectory, which is the physical Hamiltonian of a photon with wave-vector k.

To quantize the theory, we introduce a vacuum state $\big|0\big\rangle$, annihilated by all negative frequency modes in $J^p\mathcal{HP}^*$. Under the ansatz (7.23), this means that all modes with negative m are assumed to annihilate the vacuum. The state cohomology $J^p\mathfrak{H} = H^0_{st}(Q)$ is then a p-jet approximation to the photon Fock space.

8.6 Yang-Mills theory and gauge anomalies

As noted in subsection 8.3 above, the gauge generators

$$\mathcal{J}_X = \sum_M^p \int dt \ \sum_\mu X_{M+\mu}(q(t)) E^\mu_M(t) \tag{8.62}$$

satisfy the abelian algebra of gauge transformations, $[\mathcal{J}_X, \mathcal{J}_Y] = 0$, which is identified with the algebra $\mathfrak{map}(d, \mathfrak{u}(1))$ of maps from d-dimensional space to $\mathfrak{u}(1)$. In the free Maxwell case, there are no contributions to $\mathcal{J}_X$ from the antijets, because they all transform trivially under $\mathfrak{u}(1)$. However, interacting theories can be treated with similar methods. As sketched in the next section, interactions bring in some new problems, but the key phenomena can be understood by analogy with the Maxwell field.

As the simplest example of an interacting gauge theory, consider a pure non-abelian gauge theory with gauge symmetry $\mathfrak{map}(d, \mathfrak{g})$, where $\mathfrak{g}$ is some finite-dimensional Lie algebra. All fields and antijets transform in the adjoint representation, except $A^a_{\mu,M}$ which transforms as a connection; a is a $\mathfrak{g}$ index. There are now several contributions to the gauge generators,

$$\mathcal{J}_X = \mathcal{J}^G_X + \mathcal{J}^A_X + \mathcal{J}^D_X + \mathcal{J}^S_X + \mathcal{J}^{GT}_X + \mathcal{J}^{AT}_X + \mathcal{J}^{DT}_X + \mathcal{J}^{ST}_X, \tag{8.63}$$

where each term is a bilinear in a field jet and the corresponding canonical momentum, according to the following table:

$\mathcal{J}^G_X$	$\mathcal{J}^A_X$	$\mathcal{J}^D_X$	$\mathcal{J}^S_X$	$\mathcal{J}^{GT}_X$	$\mathcal{J}^{AT}_X$	$\mathcal{J}^{DT}_X$	$\mathcal{J}^{ST}_X$
c^a_M	$A^a_{\mu,M}$	$A^{*a}_{\mu,M}$	ζ^a_M	$\bar{c}^a_M$	$\bar{A}^a_{\mu,M}$	$\bar{A}^{*a}_{\mu,M}$	$\bar{\zeta}^a_M$

E.g., the part acting on the antijet $A^{*a}_{\mu,M}(t)$ is

$$\mathcal{J}^D_X = \sum_M^{p-2} i f^{abc} \int dt \ X^a(q(t)) \,{:}A^{*b}_{\mu,M}(t) E^{*c\mu}_M(t){:}\,, \tag{8.64}$$

where f^{abc} are the totally antisymmetric structure constants of $\mathfrak{g}$ and double dots indicate normal ordering w.r.t. frequency.

It was shown in [7] that such a bilinear combination acquires an anomaly, which turns $\mathfrak{map}(d, \mathfrak{g})$ into a higher-dimensional generalization of the affine Kac-Moody algebra $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}$. Similarly, in a general-covariant theory, the diffeomorphism generators $\mathcal{L}_\xi$, where $\xi = \xi^\mu(x)\partial_\mu$, satisfy a multi-dimensional generalization of the Virasoro algebra, i.e. an abelian but non-central extension of the algebra of vector fields in d dimensions, $\mathfrak{vect}(d)$. The abelian extension of $\mathfrak{vect}(d) \ltimes \mathfrak{map}(d, \mathfrak{g})$ is defined by the brackets

$$\begin{aligned}
[\mathcal{L}_\xi, \mathcal{L}_\eta] &= \mathcal{L}_{[\xi,\eta]} + \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int dt\ \dot q^\rho(t) \Big\{ c_1 \partial_\rho \partial_\nu \xi^\mu(q(t)) \partial_\mu \eta^\nu(q(t)) + \\
&\quad + c_2 \partial_\rho \partial_\mu \xi^\mu(q(t)) \partial_\nu \eta^\nu(q(t)) \Big\}, \\
[\mathcal{L}_\xi, \mathcal{J}_X] &= \mathcal{J}_{\xi X}, \qquad (8.65) \\
[\mathcal{J}_X, \mathcal{J}_Y] &= \mathcal{J}_{[X,Y]} - \frac{k}{2\pi i} \delta^{ab} \int dt\ \dot q^\rho(t) \partial_\rho X_a(q(t)) Y_b(q(t)), \\
[\mathcal{L}_\xi, q^\mu(t)] &= \xi^\mu(q(t)), \\
[\mathcal{J}_X, q^\mu(t)] &= [q^\mu(t), q^\nu(t')] = 0,
\end{aligned}$$

To see that this Lie algebra generalizes the Virasoro and affine algebras to several dimensions, define for each $m = (m_\mu) \in \mathbb{Z}^d$: $L_\mu(m) = \mathcal{L}_\xi$ for $\xi^\nu(x) = -i \exp(im \cdot x) \delta^\nu_\mu$, $J^a(m) = \mathcal{J}_X$ for $X^a(x) = \exp(im \cdot x) J^a$, and $S^\mu(m) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int dt\ \dot q^\mu(t) \exp(im \cdot x)$. The algebra (8.65) then acquires the form

$$\begin{aligned}
[L_\mu(m), L_\nu(n)] &= n_\nu L_\mu(m+n) - m_\mu L_\nu(m+n) + \\
&\quad - (c_1 m_\nu n_\mu + c_2 m_\mu n_\nu) m_\rho S^\rho(m+n), \\
[L_\mu(m), J^a(n)] &= n_\mu J^a(m+n), \qquad (8.66) \\
[J^a(m), J^b(n)] &= i f^{abc} J^c(m+n) - k m_\mu S^\mu(m+n), \\
m_\mu S^\mu(m) &\equiv 0, \qquad \text{for all } m.
\end{aligned}$$

The last equation expresses that the integral of a total derivative vanishes. Since the equation $mS(m) = 0$ implies that $S(m)$ is proportional to a Kronecker delta, (8.66) reduces to $Vir \ltimes \hat{\mathfrak{g}}$ when $d = 1$.

The parameters $c_1 - c_4$ and k were also computed in that paper. In particular, the gauge anomaly for a p-jet is given by

$$k = \pm y \binom{d+p}{d}, \qquad (8.67)$$

where y is value of the second Casimir operator (here in the adjoint representation), d is the number of dimensions, p is the truncation order, and the sign depends on Grassmann parity. If we now truncate the jets as indicated in the definition of the BRST operator (8.44), i.e.

Jet	c^a_M	$A^a_{\mu,M}$	$A^{*a}_{\mu,M}$	ζ^a_M	$\bar c^a_M$	$\bar A^a_{\mu,M}$	$\bar A^{*a}_{\mu,M}$	$\bar\zeta^a_M$
Order	$p+1$	p	$p-2$	$p-3$	p	$p-1$	$p-3$	$p-4$
Components	1	d	d	1	1	d	d	1
Parity	F	B	F	B	B	F	B	F

the total abelian charge becomes

$$\begin{aligned} k(p) &= y\Big(-\binom{d+p+1}{d} + d\binom{d+p}{d} - d\binom{d+p-2}{d} + \binom{d+p-3}{d} \\ &+ \binom{d+p}{d} - d\binom{d+p-1}{d} + d\binom{d+p-3}{d} - \binom{d+p-4}{d}\Big) \qquad (8.68) \\ &= y\Big(-\binom{d+p}{d-1} + d\binom{d+p-1}{d-1} - d\binom{d+p-3}{d-1} + \binom{d+p-4}{d-1}\Big). \end{aligned}$$

This result result immediately leads to two observations. First, and unlike the abelian case, we can not factor out the gauge transformations due to the anomaly. Second, $k(p) \to \infty$ when $p \to \infty$, which indicates that the field theory limit is problematic.

Since the gauge algebra is anomalous, we can not impose the gauge symmetry as a constraint, and thus it would appear that the Q_G and Q_{GT} terms must be discarded from the BRST operator. This would be disturbing, because we want QJT to correspond to QFT in the limit $p \to \infty$, and in QFT there is no anomaly. However, it might be possible to save part of the gauge invariance. Truncate the sums in $\mathcal{J}^G_X$, $\mathcal{J}^A_X$, $\mathcal{J}^D_X$ and $\mathcal{J}^S_X$ at $|M| \leqslant p-3$, and the sums in $\mathcal{J}^{GT}_X$, $\mathcal{J}^{AT}_X$, $\mathcal{J}^{DT}_X$ and $\mathcal{J}^{ST}_X$ at $|M| \leqslant p-4$. Hence we replace e.g. (8.64) by

$$\mathcal{J}^{D(p-3)}_X = \sum_M^{p-3} i f^{abc} \int dt\ X^a(q(t))\, {:}A^{*b}_{\mu,M}(t) E^{*c\mu}_M(t){:}\,. \qquad (8.69)$$

Then we see that the modified gauge generators

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}^{(p-3)}_X &= \mathcal{J}^{G(p-3)}_X + \mathcal{J}^{A(p-3)}_X + \mathcal{J}^{D(p-3)}_X + \mathcal{J}^{S(p-3)}_X \qquad (8.70) \\ &+ \mathcal{J}^{GT(p-4)}_X + \mathcal{J}^{AT(p-4)}_X + \mathcal{J}^{DT(p-4)}_X + \mathcal{J}^{ST(p-4)}_X \end{aligned}$$

do indeed satisfy $\mathfrak{map}(d, \mathfrak{g})$ without an anomaly, because the abelian charge is now

$$\begin{aligned} k(p) &= y\Big((-1+d-d+1)\binom{d+p-3}{d} + (1-d+d-1)\binom{d+p-4}{d}\Big) \\ &= 0. \qquad (8.71) \end{aligned}$$

The $\mathfrak{map}(d, \mathfrak{u}(1))$ symmetry acts on full history phase space $J^p\mathcal{HP}$, but it acts as a gauge symmetry only on $J^{p-3}\mathcal{HP}$; the action on the space of jet components with $p-2 \leqslant |M| \leqslant p$ is anomalous. The origin of this anomaly is that we make a regularization, which can not preserve all properties of the unregularized theory. In this case, the regularization consists of truncating the jets; we can identify $\mathcal{HP} \cong J^\infty\mathcal{HP}$, but replacing $J^\infty\mathcal{HP}$ with $J^p\mathcal{HP}$ amounts to a regularization. In this process, some properties of the original theory is lost; e.g., the jet components with $p-1 \leqslant |M| \leqslant p$ are not subject to a dynamics constraint.

Thus we can not implement the full symmetry $\mathcal{J}_X$ as a constraint, but only the truncated gauge symmetry $\mathcal{J}_X^{(p-3)}$. Returning to the abelian case, we should hence replace Q_A and Q_{AT} in (8.44) by

$$\begin{aligned} Q_A &= \sum_M^{p-3} \int dt\ c_{M+\mu}(t) E^\mu_M(t), \\ Q_{AT} &= \sum_M^{p-4} \int dt\ (DA_{\mu,M}(t) - \bar{c}_{M+\mu}(t)) \bar{E}^\mu_M(t). \end{aligned} \tag{8.72}$$

However, since the gauge field transforms as a connection, we need the ghost jets c_M and $\bar{c}_M$ up to one order higher, i.e. for $|M| \leqslant p-2$ and $|M| \leqslant p-3$, respectively; cf. the appearence of $c_{M+\mu}$ above. Finally, we must modify one more term in the BRST operator, namely

$$Q_{GT} = \sum_M^{p-2} \int dt\ Dc_M(t) \bar{b}_M(t). \tag{8.73}$$

This means that the total anomaly (8.68) is replaced by

$$\begin{aligned} k(p) = y\Big(&- \binom{d+p-2}{d} + d\binom{d+p}{d} - d\binom{d+p-2}{d} + \binom{d+p-3}{d} \\ &+ \binom{d+p-3}{d} - d\binom{d+p-1}{d} + d\binom{d+p-3}{d} - \binom{d+p-4}{d}\Big) \\ = y\Big(&- \binom{d+p-3}{d-1} + d\binom{d+p-1}{d-1} - d\binom{d+p-3}{d-1} + \binom{d+p-4}{d-1}\Big) \\ = y\Big(&d\binom{d+p-1}{d-1} - d\binom{d+p-3}{d-1} - \binom{d+p-4}{d-2}\Big). \end{aligned} \tag{8.74}$$

This expression is still nonzero, and diverges with p whenever $d > 1$. However, the last term only diverges when $d > 2$, which is a clear improvement. Let us study the relevant terms more closely. If we truncate the ghost c_M at order $p+1$, the contributions from c_M, ζ_M and their barred antijets sum up to

$$-\binom{d+p}{d-1} + \binom{d+p-4}{d-1}, \tag{8.75}$$

which is infinite for $d > 1$. However, if we instead truncate the ghost at order $p-2$, the relevant sum becomes

$$-\binom{d+p-3}{d-1} + \binom{d+p-4}{d-1} = -\binom{d+p-4}{d-2}, \tag{8.76}$$

which is finite also when $d = 2$.

Of course, we don't want to avoid infinite anomalies only when $d \leqslant 2$, but also in the physical case $d = 4$. It was noticed in [8] that we can arrange the field content to cancel the infinite parts of the anomalies, and this procedure naturally singles out $d = 4$ dimensions. This follows from the properties of the binomial coefficients and the fact that we must introduce jets ranging from order p ($A_{\mu,M}$) to order $p-4$ ($\bar{\zeta}_M$). Compared to the calculation of $k(p)$ in this subsection, we also need to add fermions to cancel more infinities.

This prescription produced a qualitatively correct field content, but there was a glaring discrepancy: fermionic antijets truncated at order $p-2$ were also needed, which at the time was interpreted as some kind of supersymmetry. It was then observed in [10] that the right kind of cancellation would occur, if we reinterpreted these antijets as ghosts. However, why the ghosts should be truncated at order $p-2$ rather than at order $p+1$ remained a mystery, until now: the ghosts should be truncated at order $p-2$ because the gauge symmetry is truncated at order $p-3$.

We emphasize that the anomalies in (8.65) is a distinguishing feature of QJT. It is clear that the relevant cocycles are functionals of the observer's trajectory $q^\mu(t)$. Hence these anomalies can not arise in QFT, where the observer has not been explicitly introduced.

9 Interactions

9.1 General structure

The detailed study of interacting theories within the present framework is postponed to another paper. However, we briefly sketch what modifications are involved. In this subsection, we use the standard abbreviated notation, where a single generalized index α can stands either for a discrete index, a continuous time variable t, or a continuous spacetime coordinate x, or a combination of all. Contraction of generalized indices involves summation over repeated discrete indices and integration over repeated continuous variables.

Assume that we have a dynamical system described by some bosonic degrees of freedom ϕ^α and an action functional S. We introduce history momenta π_α, subject to the nonzero Poisson brackets

$$[\phi^\alpha, \pi_\beta] = i\delta^\alpha_\beta. \tag{9.1}$$

The dynamics constraint reads

$$\mathcal{E}_\alpha = \partial_\alpha S \equiv \frac{\delta S}{\delta\phi^\alpha} = i[\pi_\alpha, S] \approx 0. \tag{9.2}$$

The second derivative of the action is symmetric:

$$\partial_\alpha \mathcal{E}_\beta = \partial_\beta \mathcal{E}_\alpha = \frac{\delta^2 S}{\delta\phi^\alpha \delta\phi^\beta}. \tag{9.3}$$

We assume that there exist functions $u^\alpha_\omega = u^\alpha_\omega(\phi)$, such that[1]

$$u^\alpha_\omega \mathcal{E}_\alpha \quad \equiv \quad 0. \tag{9.4}$$

The index ω labels solutions to the Euler-Lagrange equations. The *solution set* $\mathcal{W}$ is the set of such labels $\omega \in \mathcal{W}$. Such functions u^α_ω clearly exist if $\mathcal{E}_\alpha = \mathcal{E}^0_\alpha = L_{\alpha\beta}\phi^\beta$ is linear, and if $\mathcal{E}_\alpha = \mathcal{E}^0_\alpha + \varepsilon\mathcal{E}^1_\alpha$, we can prove the existence of such functions to all orders in ε. One makes the ansatz

$$u^\alpha_\omega = \sum_m u^\alpha_{\omega(m)} \varepsilon^m, \tag{9.5}$$

and constructs the functions $u^\alpha_{\omega(m)}$ order by order in perturbation theory.

Physically, (9.4) simply expresses that the Euler-Lagrange equations have solutions. Namely, in a cohomological formulation, we start from an equal number of field and antifield histories, ϕ^α and ϕ^*_α. Hence the net dimension $\dim H^\bullet_{cl}(Q) = 0$, where fermionic degrees of freedom count negative. However, the cohomology should be a resolution of $C(\mathcal{P})$, i.e. $H^0_{cl}(Q) = C(\mathcal{P})$ and $H^n_{cl}(Q) = 0$, $n \neq 0$. Unless the physical phase space is empty, this implies $\dim H^\bullet_{cl}(Q) = \dim H^0_{cl}(Q) > 0$, a contradiction. This paradox is resolved by introducing further bosonic antifields corresponding to the redundancies (9.4), giving a net surplus of bosonic degrees of freedom.

---

[1] Henneaux and Teitelboim do not make this assumption in chapter 17 of [4], eq. (17.4). Since they only consider fields and antifields and not their conjugate momenta, this does not affect $H^0_{cl}(Q) = C(\mathcal{P}) = C(\mathcal{HP}^*)/\mathcal{I}$, but it makes the higher cohomology groups nonempty. Note that the redundancies (9.4) are present already for the harmonic oscillator (3.19) ($\mathcal{E}_\omega = \mathcal{E}_{-\omega} \equiv 0$).

Of course, if the number of fields exceed the number of antifields in $\mathcal{HP}^*$, as is the case in QJT, the redundancies (9.4) may be absent.

Define

$$\pi_\omega = u^\alpha_\omega \pi_\alpha. \tag{9.6}$$

It follows from (9.2) and (9.4) that all π_ω commute with the action, $[\pi_\omega, S] = 0$. By the Jacobi identity, $[[\pi_\omega, \pi_\varpi], S] = 0$. By assumption, it must therefore be possible to expand $[\pi_\omega, \pi_\varpi]$ in terms of $\pi_\upsilon \in \mathcal{W}$:

$$[\pi_\omega, \pi_\varpi] = i f_{\omega\varpi}{}^\upsilon \pi_\upsilon, \tag{9.7}$$

whereas explicit calculation yields

$$f_{\omega\varpi}{}^\upsilon u^\alpha_\upsilon \;=\; u^\beta_\varpi \partial_\beta u^\alpha_\omega - u^\beta_\omega \partial_\beta u^\alpha_\varpi. \tag{9.8}$$

The brackets (9.7) define the *momentum algebra* $\mathfrak{m}$. Note that the structure functions $u^\alpha_\omega(\phi)$ and $f_{\omega\varpi}{}^\upsilon(\phi)$ depend on the field ϕ^α in general. The Jacobi identities yield

$$\begin{aligned} &f_{\omega\varpi}{}^\varsigma f_{\upsilon\varsigma}{}^\lambda + f_{\varpi\upsilon}{}^\varsigma f_{\omega\varsigma}{}^\lambda + f_{\upsilon\omega}{}^\varsigma f_{\varpi\varsigma}{}^\lambda = \\ &u^\alpha_\omega \partial_\alpha f_{\varpi\upsilon}{}^\lambda + u^\alpha_\varpi \partial_\alpha f_{\upsilon\omega}{}^\lambda + u^\alpha_\upsilon \partial_\alpha f_{\omega\varpi}{}^\lambda. \end{aligned} \tag{9.9}$$

We now construct the BRST operator which eliminates the dynamics constraint (9.2) and the antifield constraint implied by (9.4). Introduce antifields and antifield momenta according to the following table

Field	Momentum	Parity	Constraint
ϕ^α	π_α	B	
ϕ^*_α	π^α_*	F	$\mathcal{E}_\alpha$
θ_ω	χ^ω	B	$u^\alpha_\omega \phi^*_\alpha$

(9.10)

The nonzero Poisson brackets are, in addition to (9.1),

$$\{\phi^*_\alpha, \pi^\beta_*\} = \delta^\beta_\alpha, \qquad [\theta_\omega, \chi^\varpi] = i\delta^\varpi_\omega. \tag{9.11}$$

The BRST charge reads $Q = Q_D + Q_A$, where

$$Q_D = \mathcal{E}_\alpha \pi^\alpha_*, \qquad Q_A = u^\alpha_\omega \phi^*_\alpha \chi^\omega. \tag{9.12}$$

Q acts on $C(\mathcal{HP}^*)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \delta\phi^\alpha &= 0, & \delta\pi_\alpha &= i\partial_\alpha \mathcal{E}_\beta \pi^\beta_* + i\partial_\alpha u^\beta_\omega \phi^*_\beta \chi^\omega, \\ \delta\phi^*_\alpha &= \mathcal{E}_\alpha, & \delta\pi^\alpha_* &= u^\alpha_\omega \chi^\omega, \\ \delta\theta_\omega &= -iu^\alpha_\omega \phi^*_\alpha, & \delta\chi^\omega &= 0. \end{aligned} \tag{9.13}$$

By construction, the field part of the cohomology equals $H^0_{cl}(Q) = C(\phi)/\mathcal{I}$, where $C(\phi)$ is the space of functions over ϕ^α and $\mathcal{I}$ is the ideal generated by $\mathcal{E}_\alpha$, and $H^n_{cl}(Q) = 0$ if $n \neq 0$. In view of (9.4), this space is generated by independent elements $\phi^\omega(\phi)$ labelled by $\omega \in \mathcal{W}$, where

$$\phi^\alpha = \phi^\omega u^\alpha_\omega. \tag{9.14}$$

Let us now consider the momentum part. $\mathcal{E}_\alpha \pi^\alpha_* = \delta(\phi^*_\alpha \pi^\alpha_* - i\theta_\omega \chi^\omega)$ and χ^ω belong both to the kernel and to the image, and thus vanish in cohomology. We also note that $\delta\pi_\alpha = i\partial_\alpha \delta(\phi^*_\beta \pi^\beta_*)$. Define

$$\tilde\pi_\omega = u^\alpha_\omega \pi_\alpha + i\partial_\alpha u^\beta_\omega \phi^*_\beta \pi^\alpha_* - f_{\omega\varpi}{}^\upsilon \theta_\upsilon \chi^\varpi. \tag{9.15}$$

Using (9.3), (9.4), (9.8) and (9.9), it is straightforward to verify that $\tilde\pi_\omega$ is BRST closed, $\delta\tilde\pi_\omega = 0$. The space of all $\tilde\pi_\omega$, $\omega \in \mathcal{W}$, is not closed under the bracket in $\mathcal{HP}^*$. However, it is closed up to a BRST exact term:

$$[\tilde\pi_\omega, \tilde\pi_\varpi] = if_{\omega\varpi}{}^\upsilon \tilde\pi_\upsilon + \delta G_{\omega\varpi}, \tag{9.16}$$

where

$$G_{\omega\varpi} = -i\partial_\alpha f_{\omega\varpi}{}^\upsilon \theta_\upsilon \pi^\alpha_*. \tag{9.17}$$

When restricted to $H^\bullet_{cl}(Q_D + Q_A)$, the $\tilde\pi_\omega$ define a proper Lie algebra isomorphic to the momentum algebra $\mathfrak{m}$ (9.7) generated by π_ω.

So far, we have found that $H^0_{cl}(Q_D + Q_A)$ is generated by ϕ^ω and $\tilde\pi_\omega$. The implementation of the momentum constraint is complicated by the fact that the momentum algebra $\mathfrak{m}$ is no longer abelian. Therefore, we need to pass from the variables $(\phi^\omega, \tilde\pi_\omega)$ to new variables (q^ω, p_ω), in which the momentum constraint is abelian. For simplicity, we first assume that the structure constants $f_{\omega\varpi}{}^\upsilon$ do not depend on ϕ. The bracket between ϕ^ω and $\tilde\pi_\varpi$ must obey the Jacobi identities, which leads to

$$[\phi^\omega, \tilde\pi_\varpi] = -if_{\upsilon\varpi}{}^\omega \phi^\upsilon + c^\omega_\varpi, \tag{9.18}$$

where the structure constants c^ω_ϖ obeys the cocycle condition

$$f_{\omega\varsigma}{}^\upsilon c^\varsigma_\varpi - f_{\varpi\varsigma}{}^\upsilon c^\varsigma_\omega = f_{\omega\varpi}{}^\varsigma c^\upsilon_\varsigma. \tag{9.19}$$

Moreover, $[\phi^\omega, \phi^\varpi] = 0$ because ϕ^ω depends on the fields ϕ^α only. The bracket (9.18) thus defines an abelian extension of the coadjoint representation of the momentum algebra $\mathfrak{m}$. Define new variables (q^ω, p_ω), with Poisson brackets

$$\begin{aligned} [q^\omega, p_\varpi] &= i\delta^\omega_\varpi, \\ [q^\omega, q^\varpi] &= [p_\omega, p_\varpi] = 0, \end{aligned} \tag{9.20}$$

by

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\pi}_\omega &= f_{\omega\varpi}{}^{\upsilon} q^{\varpi} p_{\upsilon} - i p_{\varpi} c^{\varpi}_{\omega}, \\ \phi^\omega &= q^\omega. \end{aligned} \tag{9.21}$$

It is straightforward to verify that these expressions satisfy (9.7) and (9.18).

More generally, assume that there are functions $v^{\varpi}_{\omega}(\phi)$, which depend on ϕ^ω with $\omega \in \mathcal{W}$ only (and not on general histories ϕ^α), satisfying

$$f_{\omega\varpi}{}^{\upsilon} v^{\varrho}_{\upsilon} = v^{\varsigma}_{\varpi} \partial_{\varsigma} v^{\varrho}_{\omega} - v^{\varsigma}_{\omega} \partial_{\varsigma} v^{\varrho}_{\varpi}. \tag{9.22}$$

This relation is essentially the same as (9.8), except that it only depends on elements in the solution set $\mathcal{W}$. Then we replace (9.21) by

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\pi}_\omega &= v^{\varpi}_{\omega}(q) p_{\varpi}, \\ \phi^\omega &= q^\omega. \end{aligned} \tag{9.23}$$

One checks that the bracket $[\tilde{\pi}_\omega, \tilde{\pi}_\varpi]$ is still given by the momentum algebra (9.7), and that the ϕ^ω transform as

$$[\phi^\omega, \tilde{\pi}_\varpi] = i v^{\omega}_{\varpi}(\phi). \tag{9.24}$$

We now invert the coordinate transformations (9.21) or (9.23), and obtain a map $(\phi^\omega, \pi_\omega) \to (q^\omega, p_\omega)$. Introduce a set of antisymmetric constants $c_{\omega\varpi} = -c_{\varpi\omega}$, $\omega, \varpi \in \mathcal{W}$; $c_{\omega\varpi} q^\omega$ can be thought of as the velocity. Define the momentum constraint by

$$\mathcal{M}_\omega = p_\omega - c_{\omega\varpi} q^\varpi. \tag{9.25}$$

It satisfies the brackets

$$[\mathcal{M}_\omega, \mathcal{M}_\varpi] = -2i c_{\omega\varpi}. \tag{9.26}$$

Introduce new antifields α_ω satisfying the same algebra with opposite sign:

$$[\alpha_\omega, \alpha_\varpi] = 2i c_{\omega\varpi}. \tag{9.27}$$

Further introduce fermionic antifields β_ω with canonical momentum γ^ω; $\{\beta_\omega, \gamma^\varpi\} = \delta^\varpi_\omega$. The momentum part of the BRST operator is defined by

$$Q_{\mathcal{M}} = (p_\omega - c_{\omega\varpi} q^\varpi + \alpha_\omega) \gamma^\omega. \tag{9.28}$$

It acts on $H^\bullet_{cl}(Q_D+Q_A)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \delta q^\omega &= -i\gamma^\omega, & \delta p_\omega &= ic_{\omega\varpi}\gamma^\varpi, \\ \delta\beta_\omega &= \mathcal{M}_\omega + \alpha_\omega, & \delta\gamma^\omega &= 0, \\ \delta\alpha_\omega &= -2ic_{\omega\varpi}\gamma^\varpi. \end{aligned} \tag{9.29}$$

The kernel is generated by $p_\omega + c_{\omega\varpi}q^\varpi$, $p_\omega - c_{\omega\varpi}q^\varpi + \alpha_\omega$, and γ^ω, and the image by $\mathcal{M}_\omega + \alpha_\omega$ and γ^ω. The cohomology is thus generated by

$$a_\omega = p_\omega + c_{\omega\varpi}q^\varpi + x^\varpi_\omega(\mathcal{M}_\varpi + \alpha_\varpi), \tag{9.30}$$

for arbitrary constants x^ϖ_ω. It is easily verified that the bracket

$$[a_\omega, a_\varpi] = 2ic_{\omega\varpi} \tag{9.31}$$

is independent of these constants. Hence the physical phase space $\mathcal{P} = C(a_\omega)$ is identified with the space of functions over a_ω.

It might appear that we have transformed the original interacting theory to a free theory defined by the oscillators (9.31), but this is not the case. Since the Hamiltonian is the generator of rigid time translations, it has a very simple form in $\mathcal{HP}$:

$$\mathcal{H}(\phi^\alpha, \pi_\alpha) = h^\beta_\alpha \phi^\alpha \pi_\beta, \tag{9.32}$$

where h^β_α is a constant matrix. That the Hamiltonian has this simple bilinear form is a major advantage of a history formulation. However, when expressed in terms of the cohomology variables, the Hamiltonian

$$\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}(\phi^\omega, \pi_\omega) = \mathcal{H}(q^\omega, p_\omega) = \mathcal{H}(a_\omega) \tag{9.33}$$

becomes a complicated, nonlinear function. Hence the theory is not a free theory; we have merely expressed the bracket in Darboux variables.

9.2 Gauge transformations

In the previous subsection, we assumed that all degrees of freedom were physical. In a gauge theory, some degrees of freedom are redundant, leading to identities of the form

$$r^\alpha_a \mathcal{E}_\alpha \equiv 0, \tag{9.34}$$

where $r^\alpha_a = r^\alpha_a(\phi)$ may depend on the fields ϕ^α. Equation (9.34) can be written as $[J_a, S] = 0$, where the gauge generators are

$$J_a = r^\alpha_a \pi_\alpha. \tag{9.35}$$

There is a striking similarity between the redundancy related to the existence of solutions (9.4) and the gauge redundancy (9.34), and between the the momentum generators π_ω in (9.6) and the gauge generators J_a in (9.35). In the present abbreviated formalism, there appears to be no difference at all, apart from a change in lettering. However, in the fuller formalism of the next subsection, where we explicitly keep track of the time variable, there is a difference: the momentum generators are time independent, but the gauge generators depend on time. This amounts to replacing $\alpha \to (\alpha, t)$, $a \to (a, t)$, but $\omega \to \omega$, in all formulas. Since a well-posed Cauchy problem can not depend on arbitrary functions of time, the gauge degrees of freedom should be eliminated, at least classically.

Both gauge and momentum generators preserve the action, $[J_a, S] = [\pi_\omega, S] = 0$. If the J_a and π_ω exhaust the linear functions of π_α with this property, it must be possible to expand the brackets as

$$\begin{aligned}
[\pi_\omega, \pi_\varpi] &= i f_{\omega\varpi}{}^{\upsilon} \pi_\upsilon + i f_{\omega\varpi}{}^{a} J_a, \\
[\pi_\omega, J_a] &= i f_{\omega a}{}^{\varpi} \pi_\varpi + i f_{\omega a}{}^{b} J_b, \\
[J_a, J_b] &= i f_{ab}{}^{\omega} \pi_\omega + i f_{ab}{}^{c} J_c.
\end{aligned} \tag{9.36}$$

Now we make the simplifying assumption that this algebra is in fact a direct sum $\mathfrak{m} \oplus \mathfrak{g}$ of the momentum algebra $\mathfrak{m}$ and the gauge algebra $\mathfrak{g}$, i.e. $f_{\omega\varpi}{}^{a} = f_{\omega a}{}^{\varpi} = f_{\omega a}{}^{b} = f_{ab}{}^{\omega} = 0$. This means that the gauge generators J_a are closed under the bracket:

$$[J_a, J_b] = i f_{ab}{}^{c} J_c, \tag{9.37}$$

where

$$f_{ab}{}^{c} r_c^\alpha = r_b^\beta \partial_\beta r_a^\alpha - r_a^\beta \partial_\beta r_b^\alpha. \tag{9.38}$$

The Jacobi identities imply

$$f_{ab}{}^{d} f_{cd}{}^{e} + f_{bc}{}^{d} f_{ad}{}^{e} + f_{ca}{}^{d} f_{bd}{}^{e} = r_a^\alpha \partial_\alpha f_{bc}{}^{e} + r_b^\alpha \partial_\alpha f_{ca}{}^{e} + r_c^\alpha \partial_\alpha f_{ab}{}^{e}.$$

Moreover, from $f_{a\omega}{}^{b} r_b^\alpha = f_{a\omega}{}^{\varpi} u_\varpi^\alpha = 0$ follows the identity

$$u_\omega^\beta \partial_\beta r_a^\alpha - r_a^\beta \partial_\beta u_\omega^\alpha = 0, \tag{9.39}$$

which will be used extensively below.

The algebra (9.37) is an open algebra, where the structure functions $f_{ab}{}^{c}(\phi)$ depend on the field ϕ^α. Since our purpose is to give a rapid sketch on how gauge symmetries fit into the picture, rather than dealing with the most general case, we make the simplifying assumption that the ${f_{ab}}^c$ are in fact ϕ-independent constants; this amounts to

$$\partial_\alpha {f_{ab}}^c = 0. \tag{9.40}$$

A profound difference between the momentum redundancy (9.4) and the gauge redundancy (9.34) is that the former is used to eliminate half of the variables, because the momentum constraint identifies momenta and velocities, whereas the gauge variables are truly redundant and should be eliminated altogether. The antifields θ_ω do not affect $H^0_{cl}(Q) = C(\mathcal{HP})/\mathcal{I}$, where $\mathcal{I}$ is the ideal generated by the dynamics, but only ensure that the higher cohomology groups vanish. In contrast, a gauge symmetry should change the physical phase space to $H^0_{cl}(Q) = C'(\mathcal{HP})/\mathcal{I}$, where $C'(\mathcal{HP})$ is the space of gauge-invariant functions over $\mathcal{HP}$.

To enforce gauge invariance in cohomology, we introduce fermionic ghosts c^a with canonical momenta b_a, as well as bosonic second-order antifields ζ_a with momenta ξ^a; the nonzero Poisson brackets read

$$\{c^a, b_b\} = \delta^a_b, \qquad [\zeta_a, \xi^b] = i\delta^b_a. \tag{9.41}$$

The total gauge generator is $J^{TOT}_a = J^\phi_a + J^{gh}_a$, where

$$\begin{aligned} J^\phi_a &= r^\alpha_a \pi_\alpha + i\partial_\alpha r^\beta_a \phi^*_\beta \pi^\alpha_* - {f_{ab}}^c \zeta_c \xi^b, \\ J^{gh}_a &= -i{f_{ab}}^c c^b b_c. \end{aligned} \tag{9.42}$$

We verify that J^ϕ_a and J^{gh}_a satisfy the brackets (9.37) separately, and that they commute; hence J^{TOT}_a also satisfies the same algebra $\mathfrak{g}$.

The BRST operator, before the momentum constraint is taken into account, has the form $Q = Q_G + Q_D + Q_A + Q_S$, where

$$\begin{aligned} Q_G &= (J^\phi_a + \frac{1}{2} J^{gh}_a) c^a \\ &= r^\alpha_a c^a \pi_\alpha + i\partial_\alpha r^\beta_a c^a \phi^*_\beta \pi^\alpha_* - {f_{ab}}^c c^a \zeta_c \xi^b - \frac{i}{2} {f_{ab}}^c c^a c^b b_c, \\ Q_D &= \mathcal{E}_\alpha \pi^\alpha_*, \\ Q_A &= u^\alpha_\omega \phi^*_\alpha \chi^\omega, \\ Q_S &= r^\alpha_a \phi^*_\alpha \xi^a. \end{aligned} \tag{9.43}$$

Q acts on the fields as

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \delta c^a &=& -\frac{i}{2} f_{bc}{}^a c^b c^c, \\ \delta\phi^\alpha &=& -i r^\alpha_a c^a, \\ \delta\phi^*_\alpha &=& \mathcal{E}_\alpha + i\partial_\alpha r^\beta_a c^a \phi^*_\beta, \\ \delta\theta_\omega &=& -i u^\alpha_\omega \phi^*_\alpha, \\ \delta\zeta_a &=& -i r^\alpha_a \phi^*_\alpha - i f_{ab}{}^c c^b \zeta_c. \end{array} \tag{9.44}$$

It is straightforward although quite tedious to verify nilpotency on all fields, e.g. $\delta^2\theta_\omega = 0$ and $\delta^2\zeta_a = 0$, using (9.39) and antisymmetry of the product $c^a c^b$. The cohomology is given by $H^0_{cl}(Q) = C'(\phi)/\mathcal{I}$, $H^n_{cl}(Q) = 0$ for all $n > 0$, where $C'(\phi)$ denotes the space of gauge-invariant functions of ϕ^α, and $\mathcal{I}$ is the ideal generated by $\mathcal{E}_\alpha$. A basis for this space is functions ϕ^ω defined by $\phi^\alpha = \phi^\omega u^\alpha_\omega$.

Q acts on the conjugate momenta as

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \delta b_a &=& J^\phi_a + J^{gh}_a = J^{TOT}_a, \\ \delta\pi_\alpha &=& i\partial_\alpha r^\beta_a c^a \pi_\beta - \partial_\alpha\partial_\beta r^\gamma_a c^a \phi^*_\gamma \pi^\beta_* \\ && +\, i\partial_\alpha \mathcal{E}_\beta \pi^\beta_* + i\partial_\alpha u^\beta_\omega \phi^*_\beta \chi^\omega + i\partial_\alpha r^\beta_a \phi^*_\beta \xi^a, \\ \delta\pi^\alpha_* &=& -i\partial_\beta r^\alpha_a c^a \pi^\beta_* + u^\alpha_\omega \chi^\omega + r^\alpha_a \xi^a, \\ \delta\chi^a &=& 0, \\ \delta\xi^a &=& -i f_{bc}{}^a c^b \xi^c. \end{array} \tag{9.45}$$

The cohomology is still generated by $\tilde\pi_\omega$ given by (9.15). The reason is that the gauge algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ acts trivially on the $\mathfrak{m}$ indices ω, because we assumed that $[\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{m}] = 0$. Without this assumption, the gauge algebra acts on the solution space $\mathcal{W}$ as well, and the formulas become more involved.

Hence $H^\bullet_{cl}(Q_G + Q_D + Q_A + Q_S)$ is generated by ϕ^ω and π_ω. Since these variables are gauge invariant, the momentum constraint is imposed exactly as in the previous subsection.

9.3 Time dependence

Let us now single out one of the indices α as the time variable. The formalism in the previous subsections then applies with the following modifications: In quantum mechanics, $\phi^\alpha \to \phi^\alpha(t)$, α a discrete index; in field theory, $\phi^\alpha \to \phi^\alpha(\mathbf{x}, t)$, $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ the spatial coordinate; in QJT, $\phi^\alpha \to (q^\mu(t), \phi^\alpha_M(t))$, M a multi-index and $q^\mu(t)$ the observer's trajectory.

In general, we assume a dynamical system described by some degrees of freedom $\phi^\alpha(t)$ and an action functional S. Introduce history momenta $\pi_\alpha(t)$, subject to the nonzero Poisson brackets

$$[\phi^\alpha(t), \pi_\beta(t')] = i\delta^\alpha_\beta \delta(t-t'). \tag{9.46}$$

The dynamics constraint reads

$$\mathcal{E}_\alpha(t) = \frac{\delta S}{\delta \phi^\alpha(t)} = i[\pi_\alpha(t), S] \approx 0. \tag{9.47}$$

The second derivative of the action is symmetric:

$$\frac{\delta \mathcal{E}_\beta(t')}{\delta \phi^\alpha(t)} = \frac{\delta \mathcal{E}_\alpha(t)}{\delta \phi^\beta(t')} = \frac{\delta^2 S}{\delta \phi^\alpha(t) \delta \phi^\beta(t')}. \tag{9.48}$$

Because the Euler-Langrange equations $\mathcal{E}_\alpha(t) = 0$ have solutions, there are functions $u^\alpha_\omega(t)$, such that

$$\int dt\ u^\alpha_\omega(t) \mathcal{E}_\alpha(t) \quad \equiv \quad 0. \tag{9.49}$$

The momentum operators

$$\pi_\omega = \int dt\ u^\alpha_\omega(t) \pi_\alpha(t). \tag{9.50}$$

satisfy an algebra which formally is given by the brackets (9.7), where instead of (9.8) the structure constants are now defined by

$$f_{\omega\varpi}{}^{\upsilon} u^\alpha_\upsilon(t) \quad = \quad \int dt' \bigg(u^\beta_\varpi(t') \frac{\delta u^\alpha_\omega(t)}{\delta \phi^\beta(t')} - u^\beta_\omega(t') \frac{\delta u^\alpha_\varpi(t)}{\delta \phi^\beta(t')} \bigg). \tag{9.51}$$

In contrast, a gauge index is assumed to include time, so we replace $a \to (a, t)$ in the formulas from the previous subsection. Hence assume that there exist functions $r^\alpha_a(t, t')$, such that

$$\int dt'\ r^\alpha_a(t, t') \mathcal{E}_\alpha(t') \quad \equiv \quad 0. \tag{9.52}$$

The gauge generators

$$J_a(t) = \int dt'\ r^\alpha_a(t, t') \pi_\alpha(t') \tag{9.53}$$

satisfy an algebra

$$[J_a(t), J_b(t')] = i \int dt''\ f_{ab}{}^c(t, t'; t'') J_c(t''), \tag{9.54}$$

where the structure functions $f_{ab}{}^c(t, t'; t'')$ are defined by

$$\int ds\ f_{ab}{}^c(t, t'; s) r_c^\alpha(s, t'') = \int ds\ \left(r_b^\beta(t', s) \frac{\delta r_a^\alpha(t, t'')}{\delta \phi^\beta(s)} - r_a^\beta(t, s) \frac{\delta r_b^\alpha(t', t'')}{\delta \phi^\beta(s)} \right).$$

Moreover, we assume that the momentum algebra $\mathfrak{m}$ and the gauge algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ commute, which leads to the identities (9.39):

$$\int ds\ \left(u_\omega^\beta(s) \frac{\delta r_a^\alpha(t, t')}{\delta \phi^\beta(s)} - r_a^\beta(t, s) \frac{\delta u_\omega^\alpha(t')}{\delta \phi^\beta(s)} \right) = 0. \tag{9.55}$$

We introduce antifields with nonzero brackets:

$$\{\phi_\alpha^*(t), \pi_*^\beta(t)\} = \delta_\alpha^\beta \delta(t - t'), \qquad [\theta_\omega, \chi^\varpi] = i\delta_\omega^\varpi. \tag{9.56}$$

The BRST charge reads $Q = Q_G + Q_D + Q_A + Q_S$, where

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_G &= \int dt\ (J_a^\phi(t) + \frac{1}{2} J_a^{gh}(t)) c_a(t), \\
Q_D &= \int dt\ \mathcal{E}_\alpha(t) \pi_*^\alpha(t), \\
Q_A &= \int dt\ u_\omega^\alpha(t) \phi_\alpha^*(t) \chi^\omega, \\
Q_S &= \iint dt\ ds\ r_a^\alpha(t, s) \phi_\alpha^*(s) \xi^a(t).
\end{aligned} \tag{9.57}$$

$H_{cl}^\bullet(Q)$ is generated by ϕ^ω, where $\phi^\alpha(t) = \phi^\omega u_\omega^\alpha(t)$, and

$$\tilde{\pi}_\omega = \int dt\ u_\omega^\alpha(t) \pi_\alpha(t) + i \iint dt\ dt'\ \frac{\delta u_\omega^\beta(t')}{\phi^\alpha(t)} \phi_\beta^*(t') \pi_*^\alpha(t) - f_{\omega\varpi}{}^\upsilon \theta_\upsilon \chi^\varpi.$$

The momentum algebra satisfied by $\tilde{\pi}_\omega$ takes the same form (9.7), up to a BRST exact term, since the solution set $\mathcal{W}$ contains no explicit time dependence. Hence the momentum constraint is treated exactly as in the previous subsection.

The Hamiltonian in $\mathcal{HP}^*$ is $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}^0 + \mathcal{H}^1$, where

$$\mathcal{H}^0 = \int dt\ \Big(-i\dot{c}^a(t) b_a(t) + \dot{\phi}^\alpha(t) \pi_\alpha(t) - i\dot{\phi}_\alpha^*(t) \pi_*^\alpha(t) + \dot{\zeta}_a(t) \xi^a(t) \Big),$$

and $\mathcal{H}^1$ involves the time-independent antifields. In the quantum theory, energy is bounded from below. The vacuum $\big|0\big\rangle$ is therefore annihilated by all negative-frequency modes, where frequency is the Fourier transform variable.

9.4 Free theory

Let us specialize the construction in the subsection 9.1 to free theories, e.g. the harmonic oscillator or the free scalar field considered earlier in this paper. The action is then a quadratic form

$$S = \frac{1}{2} L_{\alpha\beta}\phi^\alpha\phi^\beta, \tag{9.58}$$

where $L_{\alpha\beta} = L_{\beta\alpha}$ is a symmetric matrix. The dynamics constraint (9.2) becomes

$$\mathcal{E}_\alpha = L_{\alpha\beta}\phi^\beta \approx 0, \tag{9.59}$$

and the redundancy (9.4)

$$u^\alpha_\omega L_{\alpha\beta} = L_{\alpha\beta}u^\beta_\omega = 0. \tag{9.60}$$

In other words, the constant vector u^α_ω is a solution to the equations of motion, whereas the solution set $\mathcal{W}$ ($\omega \in \mathcal{W}$) labels such solutions. The dynamics and antifield constraints give rise to the BRST operators

$$Q_D + Q_A = L_{\alpha\beta}\phi^\alpha\pi^\beta_* + \phi^*_\alpha u^\alpha_\omega \chi^\omega, \tag{9.61}$$

and $H^\bullet_{cl}(Q_D + Q_A)$ is generated by $\pi_\omega = u^\alpha_\omega \pi_\alpha$ and ϕ^ω, where $\phi^\alpha = \phi^\omega u^\alpha_\omega$. Since u^α_ω now is a constant matrix, is has a one-sided inverse k^ω_α, defined by

$$k^\omega_\alpha u^\alpha_\varpi = \delta^\omega_\varpi. \tag{9.62}$$

Note that u^α_ω and k^ω_α are not square matrices, since the history index α runs over a much larger set of values than the solution index ω; hence the inverse is one-sided. We can use (9.62) to solve for ϕ^ω:

$$\phi^\omega = k^\omega_\alpha \phi^\alpha, \tag{9.63}$$

and we verify that (9.62) leads to the expected Poisson bracket $[\phi^\omega, \pi_\varpi] = i\delta^\omega_\varpi$. Since $\partial_\alpha u^\beta_\omega = 0$, the momentum algebra $\mathfrak{m}$ is abelian, and $f_{\omega\varpi}{}^\upsilon = 0$. Hence there is no need to abelianize $\mathfrak{m}$ by passing to new coordinate; we can take $q^\omega = \phi^\omega$ and $p_\omega = \pi_\omega$. The momentum constraint (9.25) becomes simply

$$\mathcal{M}_\omega = \pi_\omega - c_{\omega\varpi}\phi^\varpi. \tag{9.64}$$

and the cohomology is generated by

$$a_\omega = \pi_\omega + c_{\omega\varpi}\phi^\varpi + x^\varpi_\omega(\mathcal{M}_\varpi + \alpha_\varpi), \tag{9.65}$$

In particular, we recover the treatment of the harmonic oscillator in section 3 by making the substitutions

$$\begin{aligned}
&\phi^\alpha \to \phi(x) = \phi^\omega \mathrm{e}^{i\omega x}, \qquad \pi_\alpha \to \pi(x)\\
&L_{\alpha\beta} \to \delta''(x-x') + \omega^2\delta(x-x'),\\
&u^\alpha_\omega \to \mathrm{e}^{i\omega x}, \qquad k^\omega_\alpha \to \frac{1}{2\pi i}\mathrm{e}^{-i\omega x}, \qquad k^\omega_\alpha u^\alpha_\varpi \to \delta_{\omega+\varpi}, \qquad (9.66)\\
&\phi^\omega = \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int dx\ \mathrm{e}^{-i\omega x}\phi(x), \quad \pi_\omega = \int dx\ \mathrm{e}^{i\omega x}\pi(x),\\
&\phi_\omega = \phi^{-\omega}, \quad c_{\omega\varpi} = 2\pi i\delta_{\omega+\varpi}.
\end{aligned}$$

The Hamiltonian in the history phase space is given by (9.32): $\mathcal{H} = h^\beta_\alpha\phi^\alpha\pi_\beta$. We assume that the constants u^α_ω are eigenvectors of the matrix h^α_β, i.e.

$$h^\alpha_\beta u^\beta_\omega = \epsilon_\omega u^\alpha_\omega. \qquad (9.67)$$

The Hamiltonian in the extended history phase space $\mathcal{HP}^*$,

$$\mathcal{H} \;=\; h^\beta_\alpha(\phi^\alpha\pi_\beta - i\phi^*_\beta\pi^\alpha_*) + \sum_\omega \epsilon_\omega(-i\theta_\omega\chi^\omega + \beta_\omega\gamma^\omega + \frac{1}{2}\alpha_\omega\alpha_{-\omega}),$$

acts e.g. as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
[\mathcal{H},\phi^\alpha] &= -ih^\alpha_\beta\phi^\beta, &\quad [\mathcal{H},\pi_\alpha] &= ih^\beta_\alpha\pi_\beta,\\
[\mathcal{H},\phi^\omega] &= -\epsilon_\omega\phi^\omega, &\quad [\mathcal{H},\pi_\omega] &= \epsilon_\omega\pi_\omega, \qquad (9.68)\\
[\mathcal{H},c_{\omega\varpi}] &= (\epsilon_\omega+\epsilon_\varpi)c_{\omega\varpi}, &\quad [\mathcal{H},\phi_\omega] &= \epsilon_\omega\phi_\omega,
\end{aligned}$$

and analogously on other antifields, as indicated by the index structure. It follows that $\mathcal{H}$ commute with a pair of two contracted indices, and in particular $[\mathcal{H},Q]=0$, because in the BRST charge Q consistes of terms with all indices contracted.

Again, we write down the substitutions which apply to the harmonic oscillator.

$$\begin{aligned}
&h^\alpha_\beta \to -\delta'(x-x'), \quad h^\alpha_\beta u^\beta_\omega \to \omega\mathrm{e}^{i\omega x}, \quad \epsilon_\omega \to \omega,\\
&\mathcal{H} = h^\beta_\alpha\phi^\alpha\pi_\beta \to \int dx\ \phi'(x)\pi(x), \qquad (9.69)\\
&[\mathcal{H},\phi(x)] = -i\phi'(x), \quad [\mathcal{H},\phi^\omega] = -\omega\phi^\omega, \quad [\mathcal{H},a_\omega] = \omega a_\omega.
\end{aligned}$$

The physical Hilbert space by the creation operators a_ω with energy ω.

10 Discussion

10.1 Ultralocality

QJT amounts to two inventions: a formulation and cohomological treatment of dynamics as a constraint in the history phase space, and the replacement of fields by jets. We argued in the introduction that the latter is physically significant, but the former is merely a technical reformulation. Why is it needed?

The answer is that QJT is an ultralocal theory. Not only do interactions have to be local in spacetime, but everything must be formulated in terms of data on the observer's trajectory. In particular, non-local integrals like the action functional or the Hamiltonian do not make sense within QJT. Consider e.g. a system described by an action functional $S[\phi]$. In QJT, we must expand the Lagrangian density in a Taylor series around $q^\mu(t)$, *viz.*

$$\mathcal{L}(\phi(x), \partial_\mu\phi(x)) = \sum_M^p \frac{1}{M!}\mathcal{L}_M(t)(x - q(t))^M. \tag{10.1}$$

Substituting this series into the action functional, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} S[\phi] &= \int d^4x\ \mathcal{L}(\phi(x), \partial_\mu\phi(x)) \\ &= \sum_M^p \frac{1}{M!}\mathcal{L}_M(t) \int d^4x\ (x - q(t))^M. \end{aligned} \tag{10.2}$$

Clearly, the terms $\int d^4x\ (x - q(t))^M$ are ill defined, and hence we can not base a formulation on non-local integrals like $S[\phi]$. In QJT we must specify dynamics in terms of local data, such as the Euler-Lagrange equations $\mathcal{E}(x)$, which lead to well-defined Taylor data $\mathcal{E}_M(t)$.

10.2 The limits of manifest covariance

The main novelty in the present work, compared to previous papers [9, 10, 11, 12], is the introduction of the momentum constraint. Unfortunately, this breaks manifest covariance, provided that we insist on a cohomological formulation; this was shown in subsection 7.6. To see that this is inevitable, it suffices to count the degrees of freedom, in analogy with what was done for the harmonic oscillator in (3.68).

For a field theory in d-dimensional spacetime, histories are labelled by an d-dimensional index set. For a free theory, there is one history for each

$k \in \mathbb{R}^d$; we write $\dim \mathcal{HP} = \mathbb{R}^d$. However, the physical phase space $\mathcal{P}$ is the space of solutions to the Euler-Lagrange equations, labelled by Cauchy data; hence $\dim \mathcal{P} = \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$. We can not construct $\mathcal{P}$ using history antifields alone, because either all $k \in \mathbb{R}^d$ cancel exactly, and $\dim \mathcal{P} = 0$, or $\dim \mathcal{P} \sim \mathbb{R}^d$, which is too large. To construct the correct phase space with $\dim \mathcal{P} = \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$, we also need antifields labelled by solutions to the Euler-Lagrange equations.

The counting is similar for QJT(p), as discussed in subsection 7.6. There are two types of degrees of freedom: histories in p-jet space, and momentum antifields associated with the finite index set $\mathcal{K}$. The former have infinitely many components (one for each value of t), and the latter have only finitely many. Since QJT(p) is a p-jet regularization of QFT, it must only depend on finitely many degrees of freedom, which can not achieved by combining p-jet trajectories alone. Hence we must introduce also some antifields labelled by the index set $\mathcal{K}$. This inevitably breaks manifest covariance because $\mathcal{K}$ is not Poincaré invariant. The total BRST operator is $Q = Q_D + Q_\mathcal{M}$, where the dynamics part Q_D is associated with histories and the momentum part $Q_\mathcal{M}$ with the index set $\mathcal{K}$.

Nevertheless, QJT maintains a stronger version of covariance than QFT does in canonical formulations, because the introduction of the observer's trajectory defines a local time direction in a covariant way. Dynamics and canonical quantization are done in a manifestly covariant fashion, but the definition of the canonical momentum necessarily depends on the non-covariant index set $\mathcal{K}$. In the limit $p \to \infty$, $\mathcal{K}$ becomes dense on the invariantly defined surface $k^2 = \omega^2$, and one may argue that the theory is manifestly covariant.

10.3 The need for gauge anomalies

Gauge anomalies are usually considered as a sign of inconsistency, which must be avoided at all cost. However, this is factually incorrect. There exist theories with a classical gauge symmetry, which cease to be gauge theories after quantization, due to gauge anomalies. The best known example is the free subcritical string. According to the no-ghost theorem, clearly stated in section 2 of [3], the free bosonic string in d dimensions can be quantized with a ghost-free spectrum for all $d \leqslant 26$. The anomaly turns the classical conformal gauge symmetry into a quantum global symmetry, which acts on the Hilbert space instead of reducing it. This is not fatal, because unitarity is maintained.

It is true that the anomaly violates unitarity when $d > 26$, and that the interacting string is inconsistent also when $d < 26$. However, this is irrelevant if we specifically consider the free string as an example of a classical gauge theory which exhibits a consistent gauge anomaly. Moreover, the free bosonic string can be considered as a useful toy model of quantum gravity coupled to scalar fields in two dimensions [14].

If the correct quantum theory has a global infinite-dimensional symmetry, there is no way to distinguish it from a gauge theory by looking at the classical limit alone. Classically, we can always write down a nilpotent BRST operator, and thus reduce the theory, both if the original quantum symmetry was global or gauge.

As was emphasized in [13], it is also important which version of the gauge algebra we consider. For Laurent and Fourier polynomials, an anomaly is necessary for nonzero charge (for conformal symmetry, $L_0 \neq 0$ implies that all $L_m \neq 0$ because $[L_m, L_{-m}] = 2mL_0$), whereas for compact support and ordinary polynomials (L_m with $m \geqslant -1$), there exists no anomaly. It is easy to see that this is true for all kinds of gauge symmetries, e.g. conformal, diffeomorphisms, or Yang-Mills. Since we know that nonzero charge exists, and string theory tells us that Laurent polynomials are admissible, gauge anomalies are in fact inevitable.

10.4 QJT is not QFT

p-jets are an approximation to ∞-jets, which may be identified with fields, to the extent that infinite Taylor series can be identified with the functions to which they converge. Hence one may view QJT(p) as a regularization of QFT. This regularization has the unique property of preserving manifest covariance (before the momentum constraint is taken into account), but it is a regularization nonetheless, and we might naïvely expect to recover QFT results in the limit $p \to \infty$. However, this fails due to the presence of anomalies.

Gauge and diff anomalies in QFT were classified long ago [1]. In particular, in four dimensions there are gauge anomalies proportional to the third Casimir, and no diff anomalies. In QJT there are other types of anomalies, described by the extensions in (8.65): a gauge anomaly proportional to the second Casimir, and diff anomalies in all spacetime dimensions including four. The presence of new anomalies clearly shows that QJT is not merely a regularization of QFT, but something genuinely new. This is a good thing, because it is well known that QFT is incompatible with gravity, and this no-go theorem does hence not apply to QJT.

At first sight, the inequivalence between QFT and QJT(p) in the $p \to \infty$ limit might be surprising, because classically a p-jet is simply an approximation to a classical field. The origin of this discrepancy is that a Taylor expansion introduces a new datum: the expansion point (or rather the family of expansion points referred to as the observer's trajectory). This difference is significant, because the cocycles in (8.65) are functionals of $q^\mu(t)$. If we deal directly with the fields themselves, we do not introduce the observer's trajectory, and the relevant cocycles can not even be formulated.

Let us rephrase this non-equivalence slightly differently. Quantization and the field theory ($p \to \infty$) limit do not commute. The relation can be illustrated by a diagram. Let CFT and CJT(p) denote classical field theory and p-jet theory, and QFT and QJT(p) their quantum counterparts. We have the following situation:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
CJT(p) \arrow[d, "p\to\infty"] & & \arrow[r, phantom, "\overset{Quantization}{\longrightarrow}"] & & QJT(p) \arrow[d, "p\to\infty"] \\
CJT(\infty) \arrow[r, phantom, "="] & CFT \arrow[r, phantom, "\overset{Quantization}{\longrightarrow}"] & & QFT \arrow[r, phantom, "\neq"] & QJT(\infty)
\end{tikzcd}$$

10.5 Possible experimental signatures

QJT has clearly not reached the stage where it is possible to make predictions about experiments, although the Hilbert space for the harmonic oscillator is correctly reproduced. However, it is possible that one signature of QJT has already been observed; dark energy and perhaps also dark matter could be manifestations of diffeomorphism anomalies, whose existence (8.65) in four dimensions is the most striking departure from QFT.

The argument relies on low-dimensional quantum gravity, where the cosmological constant is related to a conformal anomaly as

$$c \sim \frac{\ell_{cc}}{\ell_{Planck}} = 10^{30} = (10^{120})^{1/4}.$$

Here the experimental value of the cosmological constant in four dimensions has been used. Since both diffeomorphism and conformal anomalies are extensions of infinite-dimensional spacetime algebras, it would be natural if they manifest themselves in a similar way – as a cosmological constant.

10.6 The observer and quantum gravity

Although the anomaly argument shows that QJT is inequivalent from conventional QFT, even in the $p \to \infty$ limit, there must some limit in which QFT is recovered. We argued in subsection 7.4 that this limit amounts to replacing the operator-valued curve $q^\mu(t)$ by a classical curve. Physically, this means that the observer is assumed macroscopic and classical, so her position and velocity are unaffected by the act of observation. This is clearly an idealization. Every physical observer is built from a finite, albeit perhaps large, number of elementary particles, and is thus subject to the laws of quantum mechanics.

Hence we may say that QJT amounts to a quantization of the observer and her clock, which is the operational definition of time. This clearly has implications for the interpretation of quantum mechanics; in particular, QJT disfavors the Copenhagen interpretation, which contains an assumption about a classical observer.

We can now intuitively understand why conventional quantization of gravity fails. In order that the observer be unaffected by the act of observation, we must assume that she is macroscopic and thus infinitely massive. Conventional formulations of quantum theory, and QFT in particular, thus secretly introduce an infinitely massive observer into the scene. This is usually a good approximation if we ignore gravity, but it will wreck havoc in a theory of gravity which couples to this infinite mass. E.g., in the presence of gravity, an infinitely massive observer will immediately create a black hole. This is, in my opinion, the physical reason underlying the difficulties with quantum gravity.

10.7 Principles of quantum gravity

One may expect that the fundamental principles underlying quantum gravity are the same as those underlying general relativity and QFT, namely

- Background independence.
- Locality.
- Quantum theory with a separable Hilbert space and energy bounded from below.

Background independence and locality are incompatible within the framework of QFT, because the only unitary proper lowest-energy representation of the spacetime diffeomorphism algebra is the trivial one. However, this no-go theorem does not apply to QJT, because there are new diff anomalies described by the algebra (8.65), which allow non-trivial, projective representations. This is analogous to the ordinary Virasoro algebra, which only has one unitary irrep with $c = 0$ (the trivial one), but many unitary irreps with $c > 0$.

Hence QJT is the unique way to combine all three fundamental principles of quantum gravity.

10.8 Conceptual problems of quantum gravity

As is well known, quantum gravity leads to numerous conceptual problems, known as the problem of time in various guises; for a nice list, see the discussion in section 3 of Carlip's review [2]. That author notices that all these problems can be sidestepped by defining time as "the reading of a clock", but dismisses this option for two reasons:

1. A clock only measures time along its worldline.
2. Any physical clock has a finite probability of sometimes running backwards.

These objections are evaded in QJT, in the following ways:

1. In QJT, everything is formulated in terms of data living on the clock's worldline $q^\mu(t)$, namely the Taylor coefficients $\phi_M(t)$. The magic of analyticity makes it possible to reconstruct the non-local field data $\phi(x)$ from the local Taylor data $\phi_M(t)$. In this sense, QJT only needs to make statements about events on the observer's trajectory.
2. Both the Taylor data $\phi_M(t)$ and proper time $\tau(t)$ are functions of an underlying c-number parameter t, which determines the causal structure; in particular, proper time is defined by $\dot\tau^2(t) = g_{\mu\nu,0}(t)\dot q^\mu(t)\dot q^\nu(t)$, where $g_{\mu\nu,0}(t)$ is the zero-jet of the metric.

10.9 Conclusion

In this paper, the major flaws in [9, 10, 11, 12] were corrected, and a history-oriented quantization scheme was developed, yielding perfect agreement with conventional canonical quantization. We then performed the passage to QJT. This gives the correct results for the harmonic oscillator, and interesting discrepancies (quantization of observer, reparametrization anomalies) for the free scalar field.

There are several obvious directions for future research. First of all, the formalism must be extended to interacting theories, along the lines sketched in section 9. Of particular interest is to understand the relation between renormalization and QJT. Another long-standing open problem, first introduced in [8], is to understand the field limit. Generically, the new gauge and diff anomalies in QJT(p) diverge when $p \to \infty$, which appears inconsistent. As discussed in subsection 8.6 and in [8, 9], the divergent parts can be cancelled. This works best in four dimensions, which is encouraging, but the details do not seem to work out.

References

[1] L. Bonora, P. Pasti and M. Tonin, *The anomaly structure of theories with external gravity*, J. Math. Phys. **27** (1986) 2259–2270.

[2] S. Carlip, *Quantum gravity: a progress report*, Rept. Prog. Phys. **64** (2001) 885, `gr-qc/0108040`

[3] M.B. Green, J.H. Schwarz and E. Witten, *Superstring theory, volume I: Introduction*, Cambridge Univ. Press (1987).

[4] M. Henneaux, and C. Teitelboim, *Quantization of gauge systems*, Princeton Univ. Press (1992)

[5] C. J. Isham and N. Linden, *Continuous histories and the history group in generalised quantum theory*, J. Math. Phys. **36** (1995) 5392.

[6] R. Jackiw, *Two lectures on Two-Dimensional Gravity*, `gr-qc/9511048` (1995)

[7] T.A. Larsson, *Extended diffeomorphism algebras and trajectories in jet space*, Comm. Math. Phys. **214** (2000) 469–491, `math-ph/9810003`

[8] T.A. Larsson, *Koszul-Tate cohomology as lowest-energy modules of non-centrally extended diffeomorphism algebras*, `math-ph/0210023` (2002)

[9] T.A. Larsson, *Manifestly covariant canonical quantization I: the free scalar field*, `hep-th/0411028` (2004)

[10] T.A. Larsson, *Manifestly covariant canonical quantization II: Gauge theory and anomalies*, `hep-th/0501043` (2005)

[11] T.A. Larsson, *Manifestly covariant canonical quantization III: Gravity, locality, and diffeomorphism anomalies in four dimensions*, `hep-th/0504020` (2005)

[12] T.A. Larsson, *Manifestly covariant canonical quantization of gravity and diffeomorphism anomalies in four dimensions*, in Focus on Quantum Gravity Research, ed. David C. Moore, pp 261-310, Nova Publishers (2006)

[13] T.A. Larsson, *Local, global, divergent – which gauge symmetries are redundant?*, `math-ph/0603024` (2006)

[14] H. Nicolai, K. Peeters and M. Zamaklar, *Loop quantum gravity: an outside view*, Class. Quant. Grav. **22** (2005) R193, `hep-th/0501114`.

[15] S.E. Rao and R.V. Moody, *Vertex representations for N-toroidal Lie algebras and a generalization of the Virasoro algebra*, Comm. Math. Phys. **159** (1994) 239–264.

[16] G. Sardanashvily, *Ten lectures on jet manifolds in classical and quantum field theory*, `math-ph/0203040` (2002)

[17] K. Savvidou, *The action operator for continuous-time histories*, J.Math.Phys. **40** (1999) 5657-5674, `gr-qc/9811078`